







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto



GOVT PUBNS















Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada Immigration and Labour,  
Standing Committee, 1947

(1947)

CA17044

I 34

(THE SENATE OF CANADA)

443  
7



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 1

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

CONTENTS:

Organization and discussion of Order of Reference

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1947







## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, March 26, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 11.00 a.m.

Present: The Honourable Senators, Murdock, Chairman, Blais, Buchanan, Burchill, Campbell, Daigle, Euler, Haig, Horner, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor, Veniot and Wilson, 18.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

On motion of the Honourable Senator Roebuck it was ordered that a general invitation be issued to interested persons to attend meetings of the Committee and be heard. And, that Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources, be requested to attend before the Committee at its next meeting.

On motion of the Honourable Senator Haig, seconded by Honourable Senator Roebuck it was ordered that Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, be invited to attend the meetings of the Committee.

The Chairman read a letter from Mrs. Pearl Klotz, R.R.1, Wainfleet, Ontario, with respect to admittance to Canada of certain of her relatives now in Europe, and also an extract from a letter directed to him by Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources, setting forth the regulations prohibiting the entry into Canada, of certain persons in Europe.

On motion of the Honourable Senator Haig, the Honourable Senators Buchanan, Burchill, Daigle, Murdock, Roebuck and Wilson, were appointed a Sub-Committee on agenda.

On motion of the Honourable Senator Haig it was resolved that Lieutenant-Colonel Arthur J. Hicks, Three Rivers, P.Q., former staff officer, Military Government in Europe, who appeared before the Committee at the last Session, be invited to again appear before the Committee.

It was Resolved to report as follows:

In connection with the order of reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc., the Committee recommend that it be authorized to print 1,000 copies in English and 200 copies in French of its day to day proceedings and that Rule 100 be suspended in relation to the said printing.

At 1 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday, 23rd April, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

## THE SENATE

WEDNESDAY, March 26, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 11.00 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, I think we should first put on the record the motion that was made by Senator Roebuck and which is our authority in this matter.

That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including:—

- (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada,
- (b) the type of immigrant which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics,
- (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission,
- (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and
- (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Senator Roebuck brought about the convening of this committee again this session, and I think perhaps he might go ahead now and tell us what he thinks we should undertake to do.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of the motion, I suppose the finger does point to me when we assemble. The committee did a great job last session and undoubtedly had a very great effect on public opinion, and I rather expect, also on official action. There have been two revisions of the regulations since our committee was appointed at the last session, and there seems to be an impression abroad that another revision will be made.

We are a fact finding body more than anything else, though we have the right to make recommendations, and do; but our main function is that of finding the facts.

At the last session we had before us quite a large number of very interesting witnesses. They made a great contribution to this most important subject of immigration. I suggest that we follow somewhat the same plan, but in addition we issue today a general invitation to anybody who has information or who wishes to express views that do not just affect his own case. Of course his own case should go to the Immigration Department; but if he has general views, to come here and tell us what he is thinking.

It is important to note that since the last session we now have offices in Europe. During the last session there was only one immigration office for that area, and it was in England. It had not been closed during the entire war period.

Today we have an office at Athens, Greece; at Lisbon, Portugal; in Paris, France; at Brussels, Belgium; at The Hague, Holland; at Oslo, Norway. There are more offices in the process of being opened. I am informed authoritatively that offices will shortly be opened in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. Our officials are not in Czechoslovakia, but they have not their office in order yet. I am not certain that they are in Poland, but they are going there. It is hoped that by about the 1st of May they will be ready to do business in both those countries. In Switzerland arrangements have been made with the British Passport Control Office at Berne for the giving of visas for Canada to bona fide business men and visitors who are citizens of Switzerland. Arrangements are being made, or have actually been completed, between our Department of Immigration and our External Affairs Department, for representatives of the latter department to do immigration work in Palestine.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: In Palestine?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Do you want Arabs?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There are a great many English people and others in Palestine, and a large number of relatives of Canadians, and there is work to be done in that country. I suggest that we invite the Director of Immigration to come, as he did last year.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Who is that gentleman?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is Mr. A. L. Jolliffe. He gave us a splendid talk last year and was chalked full of useful information. I would suggest that we invite him again to our first opening meeting.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I suggest that the Deputy Minister be invited, not to give evidence, but to come here to hear what goes on.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Dr. Keenleyside is deluged with invitations in that department.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: There is no more important business to be considered this year than immigration.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: May I ask if Mr. James Colley is to be invited? He is representing the inter-governmental committee, and is the former chief of immigration and colonization for the C.P.R.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Where is his office?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: He is Mr. James Colley who has an office in the Royal Bank Building.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I suggest that Keenleyside be asked to attend, because I am acquainted with him and know that he is a very able young man. I think if immigration is going to get anywhere in Canada, we have to face a tremendous problem. There is a violent difference of opinion throughout the country about the whole question, and we should have a man like Dr. Keenleyside come and hear the evidence. One can read evidence, but it can be better understood and appreciated by hearing it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is moved by Senator Haig and seconded by myself that Dr. Keenleyside be invited to attend.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have a list of the witnesses that we heard last year in the report of last session. If it is agreeable to all members of the committee I suggest that we send those people a circular letting them know that our committee is sitting and invite them to participate.



Hon. Mr. HAIG: May I interrupt once again to suggest that a young man who appeared before us last year, I think from Sherbrooke, Quebec, gave a good deal of very very fine evidence on the displaced persons.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The young man was from Three Rivers.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I should like to see him invited this year.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There are any number of young men who have been in these camps.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: He seemed to have good general knowledge and outstanding ability.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Is Mr. Colley to be included in those to be called before the committee?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes. There was a chap named Keenan who had a good deal of experience in Europe, and would make an excellent witness; I should like to invite him.

I have some information that recently came to me that I think should be placed on the record. A resolution was passed by the Episcopate of the province of Quebec, which embodies all the Bishops of that province, some twenty in number. The resolution was passed on the 11th of February, 1947, and is in the French language. I would ask that it go into our record in French, and that an English translation be placed immediately following.

#### DÉCLARATION DE L'ÉPISCOPAT DE LA PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC TOUCHANT L'IMMIGRATION

L'Épiscopat de la Province de Québec, uni de sentiment avec Sa Sainteté Pie XII, se réjouit de ce que le Gouvernement canadien soutienne la cause de ces peuples déportés et errants en plusieurs pays d'Europe en leur permettant de venir s'établir au Canada. Toutefois, il désire rappeler que, même dans l'exercice de ce devoir de charité et dans l'établissement d'une politique d'immigration, il ne faut pas perdre de vue la nécessité supérieure de sauvegarder la paix sociale à notre pays constitutionnellement chrétien, et de bâtir sa prospérité future avant tout sur une saine politique familiale.

Résolution passée par L'Épiscopat  
de la Province de Québec, à sa réunion  
trimestrielle du 11 février 1947.

Le Secrétariat Permanent  
de L'Épiscopat Canadien  
Ottawa.

#### STATEMENT OF THE EPISCOPATE OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC CONCERNING IMMIGRATION

The Episcopate of the Province of Quebec, united in feelings with His Holiness Pope Pius XII, is pleased to see that the Canadian Government is upholding the case of those displaced and wandering populations of many European countries, by allowing them to come and settle in Canada. However, the Episcopate wishes to call to mind that, while exercising this duty of charity and establishing an immigration policy,

regard must be had for the superior necessity of safeguarding social peace in our constitutionally Christian country and of basing the future prosperity of our country first of all on the family.

Resolution passed by the  
Episcopate of the Province  
of Quebec at its quarterly  
meeting held on February 11, 1947.

The Permanent Secretariat of  
The Canadian Episcopate,  
Ottawa.

I do not wish to comment at all on the resolution, but just to put it on the record. It does come to my mind, however, to mention that our present immigration regulations are anything but family in their character, because we allow single men in here and we refuse relatives of Canadian citizens on the ground that they are married. I do hope that any revisions of the rules which are in prospect will change that regulation so that men can come in here with their families.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: To what regulation do you refer when you say that they are refused permission.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I mean to say that there are regulations that the father and mother of a citizen of Canada, who is able and capable of receiving and caring for them are admissible; and the unmarried brother and sister, but not the married brother and sister; and very large numbers are being refused simply because they have committed the sin of matrimony. The brother and sister are admissible if they are single but not admissible if they are married. That is not along the lines of the bishops' thought of encouraging the family, and it is working a terrible hardship. I wonder whether honourable senators realize what it means for a Canadian to go to our own department and ask for the admission of a brother who has gone through the hell of Europe during the last few years, and be told that he cannot come to this country because he is married; or for a father to ask for the admission of a son and be told that he cannot come here because he is married.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: What was the purpose of that discrimination?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I cannot tell you. There must be some reason, because it does not seem just to me.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: It surely cannot be a prohibition.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It acts as a prohibition.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: It is in existence. I know, because I tried to get a man and his wife in from Poland. Three brothers of the wife have lived in my province for years and years, and she was refused entry because she had a husband. Both of them wanted to come in.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I would like to bring down a whole list of cases which I have, and which stir my deepest sympathy, where people have been refused on grounds such as this.

There is still another provision which I hope will be changed, in consonance with what I have been saying. That is, that a nephew or a niece is admissible only provided they are under eighteen years of age and orphaned of both parents. There are of course some terrible cases, and I can give you the actual facts of them, where a lone girl in a European country is refused admission to this country because she is nineteen, not under eighteen, although she has no rela-

tives in Europe, although she has an uncle here who would like to pay her passage over and take care of her. Of course it cuts to the very depths of some people's sympathies.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Who framed those regulations?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I do not know that. But they have been framed. The Minister primarily responsible is the Minister of Mines and Resources; but of course the whole Government is responsible for these things. I hope that in the very near future those arrangements will be changed, that some common sense and some humanity will be infused into them, and that we shall allow immigration to this country of the relatives of people already here who are capable of and willing to look after them—say, to the extent of first cousins, married or unmarried, and their wives and families. The numbers would not be very great, because, you see, you pile condition on condition. They must be relatives, they must be in good health, and the relatives must be here legally, and those relatives must be ready to guarantee their success when they arrive and, usually, pay the transportation as well.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They must be capable of supporting them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They must be capable of supporting them when they are here, and sign a guarantee that they will be supported until they are established. When you pile one condition on another condition you cut down the number very rapidly. So there would be no overwhelming crowd of relatives coming to Canada as a result of the widening of these regulations. But it would do a tremendous amount to satisfy our people that we are thinking humanly about it. And do not forget this, as I said in moving this resolution, that the very best immigrants we have or that we can possibly get are the relatives of those already here who have made good to the extent that they can take care of a relative from abroad. They have somebody to guide them when they arrive, to tell them of the Canadian way of life and how we do things, to point out how to be successful, and to aid them in being successful. They are the least likely of all immigrants who come to our shores to make Canada a mere port of entry to some other country. They are the most likely to stay, to get into business and to take part in the production of our country. So I am hoping that something will occur, and not too far away at that.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, I have here a brief which has been filed and which deals concretely with this question of immigration.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Who is it written by?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jolliffe. I have a letter from Jolliffe this morning on it, and a copy of that letter is before me, and I think it would be interesting for you to know what the apparent attitude of the Immigration Department is on these matters.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It might be worth while to read it now. Is it too long to read?

The CHAIRMAN: No. There are four or five letters to read and put on the record. Would you like to hear them?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: May I interject? At your request, as you know, I wrote to Mr. McKay. He could not appear to-day, but will be available if you wish, later.

With regard to the question of single people, it goes even further than Senator Roebuck stated, because there is a movement to bring single men to Canada for certain occupations, and I know that that would not be the policy of the Immigration Branch, which has always favoured family movements. But



in this case, in so far as my information goes, it was not limited actually to men who were single, that is not married, but it was proposed for certain specific purposes to admit men who could come without their wives. A good many of us would feel that, under present conditions, men coming here from Europe without their families would scarcely constitute the very best type of settler, and their admission certainly would not help in any way to alleviate conditions in Europe. That is something which I would like the committee to look into.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will ask Mr. Jolliffe that when he comes. I was leaving one phase of this situation to the senator, and that is the distinction which we are making between men and women in the matter of bringing in their fiancées. I expected her to say something on that subject. I have no less than three cases in my files of young Canadian women who met flyers when they were over here, became engaged, and these men having gone out of the country in the pursuance of duty, these girls want to bring back these men to be husbands for them; but the Immigration Branch will not permit it. If the thing were reversed, and it was the case of a male Canadian wishing to bring in a fiancée, the fiancée would be admissible. I have a rather worse case than that. A Canadian girl met a Polish man—it just happens to be Polish—in Canada, became engaged to him, he went away and she followed him and married him in England. Now they will not even let her in, much less allow him to come in, although she was born in this country and has a father and mother living here.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: On what ground?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: On the ground that, having married a Polish citizen, she has acquired Polish nationality and lost her British citizenship and her Canadian citizenship. In effect they say, "The place for you to go is Poland"—and she is one of our own girls, born and brought up in this country, who has met and married somebody we brought in here in the course of our war activities. We keep him and her out of our own country, and hers. It is brutal, unreasonable and unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I agree with all the sentiments expressed by Hon. Senator Wilson and Hon. Senator Roebuck. But I believe the inquiry should go further. I know that it is a great temptation, especially to those of us who are practising lawyers in any city and know the tremendous pressure of applications along the lines suggested by Senator Roebuck, to stress the points he has raised. I could cite several cases within my own knowledge. But I believe we should go further than that; we should call the representatives of organized labour, of the farmers, of industry, and other interests and obtain their views as to a general immigration policy. In making the suggestion I am not criticizing the Government, because governments are only human, and there is pressure from certain elements of organized labour against immigration, and pressure from certain parts of industry for immigration; likewise there is pressure from farmers in some parts of the country for immigration, while others are against it. In my opinion we should call representatives of all these interests to find out what they would suggest as a general policy for the Government of this country to adopt. For instance, I would ask the president and secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress, and also of the Canadian Congress of Labour, to come here and tell us what they think of these proposals.

The CHAIRMAN: They did so last year.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I know, but I would ask them now to prepare a brief and explain definitely their stand as to what they think the policy of this country should be. I would adopt the same course with regard to the organizations representing Canadian industry. Then, our mayors have a wonderful organization, including Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Halifax, Vancouver and all the other principal cities. I believe that this year the mayor of my own city is the president, and I think he should be invited to come here.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is his name?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Coulter.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What are his initials?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Garnett Coulter. I suggest that their organization should be invited to send two or three representatives, because in the cities they have to meet the immigration movement as it comes in, and handle it.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Following Senator Haig's suggestions, I would suggest that representatives of distinct industries be brought here rather than of the manufacturers association. I have a reason for suggesting that. The other day I received a letter from the general manager of the sugar beet industry in Southern Alberta, in which he stated that they required a thousand hands to work in the fields and this help was not available.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I was not trying to limit the number. I just wanted to get all these outside organizations before us.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: We might call somebody here from the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and probably he would not be informed on the needs of the mining industry, or the beet sugar industry, or the pulp and paper industry.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would call them too—all those organizations.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: That would be my suggestion.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that has been said by Senator Haig and Senator Buchanan and others, and I feel very deeply about this whole subject. After we make the inquiry as wide as we possibly can by calling on everybody who can give us any light on the subject, what shall we do then?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: We shall make recommendations.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Honourable members will recall that last year a large number of people representing various sources made excellent representations before this committee. I think the work that Senator Roebuck did on this committee last year was simply marvellous. He spent a great deal of time on it and gave his very best efforts to the furtherance of the object we had in view. But what was the result of all that? We did everything that has been suggested this morning and we called everybody we thought would throw any light on the subject, and, as I say, they made excellent representations. After that a very fine recommendation was submitted to the government, and what happened? We are in just the same position that we were in last year, even worse perhaps. I think we ought to consider this most carefully. I do not know whether a steering committee would do anything, but it seems to me the only way we can get the government to act is through publicity, and through public opinion. From our experience of last year, it would seem that any suggestions we make would have no effect on the department, and we should consider that we have to get publicity and public opinion behind us before we can get the government to do anything. Honourable members, I am of the opinion that we should seriously consider that phase of it too.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I thank the senator for those very kind remarks. It must be remembered that the department changed its recommendations, once while we were sitting and once shortly afterwards, and, while the changes were not as great as we had hoped they would be or expected or recommended they would be, they were in the direction of our recommendation. If one will observe the newspaper reports of what took place in this committee, one must come to the conclusion that public opinion was vastly influenced by what we did, and I do not think the effect of what we did has run out yet. There is still something by way of residue to come from our work.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Mr. Chairman, as you all know, we had investigations on the income tax problem as proposed by the senator from Toronto, Senator Campbell. One of the successes of the committee in getting tremendous public support was through a steering committee, as Senator Burchill just suggested. I feel that if we appointed four or five members of this committee to do something along that line we should make progress.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with practically everything that has been said, and particularly with what Senator Burchill said: that unfortunately the recommendations of a Senate committee do not always receive the attention that they should on the part of the government. However, I feel that it is only by continued pressure that we shall eventually obtain at least a measure of what we want.

Senator Haig has referred to the recommendations made last year by the Taxation Committee. That committee did good work and made some good recommendations. Unfortunately, largely because of the influence of the head of the Taxation Branch our chief recommendation was not accepted. I for one was very much disappointed. I felt that in some respects our work was almost entirely in vain, but I do not think so now. Whether it is because of the fact that a change has been made in the Income Tax Branch, the fact remains—and I do not think I am betraying any confidence particularly when I say this—that under present conditions and under the present headship, if you like, what we recommended last session is very likely to be implemented. I say that with some information behind me in regard to the matter. I think the present head of that branch is very sympathetic to the one thing we want.

Honourable members, we can accomplish a good deal by hammering away and continually pressing for the thing we want. Senator Burchill also asked what Senator Roebuck got for the excellent work which he did. Well, he has accomplished something of importance: and I agree that if we continue to press the matter we shall have some really successful impact upon the government.

Senator Burchill also said this, and I agree absolutely with him, that results are obtained not only by pressure exerted by a Senate committee—which I do not think has got quite the influence with the government that it ought to have—but mostly by the pressure of public opinion. Public opinion can only be formed through the press. If through this committee or any other committee we can induce the press to hammer away continually at what should be done, it is bound to have some influence on the public.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I agree entirely with Senator Euler. I think that if the committee sat every year and did not feel that it was getting anywhere, it would still be developing public opinion. Last year it stimulated a lot of interest that had not existed before. I am close to the newspaper business and I know how this matter was discussed. A great many organizations have taken the same attitude, and I feel that the door is opening a little further. If we keep at it it will open further by bringing out information that is necessary for public opinion.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like to make one or two observations on this point. I agree generally with what has been said. What is required as much as anything else is a clear cut statement, of what the immigration policy of this country is. Not only in this country, but abroad, many people are trying to find out what the Canadian policy on immigration is, and I feel that our present method of dealing with immigration over a period of time was wrong. It may be necessary to restrict immigration today because of lack of shipping facilities, lack of housing accommodation and other matters, which make it



impossible to bring in the great numbers I am sure are most anxious to come to the Dominion of Canada, but I do not think that that need alter the position of any country which is trying to lay down an immigration policy.

It certainly seems to me that Canada, along with the other dominions, should at the earliest possible date lay down a definite immigration policy. I may say that during a recent trip to England and the Continent I found two or three people talking about going to Australia and South Africa to every single person I heard expressing intentions of coming to Canada. It may have been that that was just my own experience in running into the people I did, but I did make some inquiries about it and I learned that the Australian government had put on quite a drive in England to get immigrants. In announcing their policy they stated they would accept about 70,000 immigrants during the first year. I believe that they had that number of persons apply, but they ran into difficulties in shipping accommodations and finding space. I understand that to overcome that difficulty the Australian government is chartering the *Acquitania* to provide for the transportation of those people who have already made arrangements to leave the United Kingdom and immigrate to Australia.

I feel that the work done by this committee last year was extremely well received by the country as a whole. I am sure that all of us here feel that Senator Roebuck deserves most of the credit for what this committee did.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: His knowledge of the subject, his interest in the problem, and his untiring efforts in helping to direct the inquiry, brought about the very excellent report that was tabled by this committee in the house last year. I agree that it is only through a committee of this sort, and through the publicity that the work of this committee gets, and the publicity given to evidence of the witnesses who appear before the committee, that immigration policy can be brought about. There are great difficulties, I suppose, in the way of laying down any overall policy to-day, but it seems to me that the time has come when we must do so.

Before taking my seat I should just like to make one observation on what Senator Euler said. I feel the work of the Taxation Committee last year accomplished something. I do not think it is betraying any confidence to say that after that committee was set up, and during the time the committee was sitting, the departmental officers were keenly interested in the evidence produced before the committee and in the recommendations that were made. There were certain recommendations which I think the great majority of the committee—all except me—felt should have been embodied in the legislation of that year, but the department felt that the act was in such a state at that time that one recommendation involving appeals from discretionary orders could not very well be granted at that time. A new measure is being considered and I hope that it may be tabled in some form during the coming session of parliament. It may require a good deal of study. It may be impossible to enact the legislation at this session, but I am sure if it reaches a point where it can be tabled with our committee, the committee would make a valuable contribution in giving it consideration and study. I hope that when that legislation is brought down many of the discretionary provisions will be eliminated. I am sure that the work this committee can do on immigration is just as valuable, if not more so, than the work done by the Committee on Taxation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Senator Campbell mentioned that Australia had chartered the *Acquitania*. I had not heard that, but I am told very authoritatively that the *Acquitania* will leave Europe—I am not sure from what port—on April 4, with fifty immigrants aboard bound for Canada. Some newspaper reports that have been written indicate larger numbers, but I understand there are fifty only, and they are relatives of people here.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I am in favour of Senator Burchill's suggestion, and therefore move that a steering committee consisting of the Chairman, Senator Roebuck, Senator Buchanan, Senator Burchill, Senator Wilson and Senator Daigle be appointed.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, when would we meet again?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would suggest that the steering committee get together and notify the chairman when they are ready to meet.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a case which I would like to draw to the attention of the committee, because it contains some facts that we should know. A lady by the name of Mrs. Pearl Klotz who lives at Wainfleet, Ontario, which is the Niagara District, has with her family made quite a success of her farming operations since coming to Canada last year. I took her case up with Mr. Jolliffe, with a view to bringing some of her relatives here to work on her farm. On the 2nd day of February she referred the matter to me again; I wrote to Mr. Jolliffe, and replied to her letter on March 20. A copy of Mr. Jolliffe's letter to me, which was not very satisfactory, was forwarded to Mrs. Klotz. I should like to read her reply:

WAINFLEET, March 23, 1947.

DEAR SENATOR MURDOCK,—This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 23, which I thank you ever so much for all the trouble you are going to for those unfortunate people of mine and Europe. Senator Murdock I would like to go into a little detail about my relatives. They are Hungarian Germans, born there since a century ago and have no sin at all, just paying with all they have to a awful war, which each one would like to forget. These people had a home, land, 2 pairs of oxen teams and a pair of horses and 7 children who all made their living at home. Last September 10 when their work was done the government took away their harvest and had the grapes harvest themself. And left them food for three months. They have been told then that they are to be displaced somewhere to Germany. They are still living in Hungary but the new owner has occupied the house already. He has a room to live in with his family and is waiting notice each day to be displaced. So dear Senator Murdock if there isn't a port of examination in Hungary, I guess we can find them in the Hungarian displaced persons camp in the American occupied zone. If they have been transferred in the meantime. Thank you again.

Yours sincerely

MRS. PEARL KLOTZ

*R.R. 1 Wainfleet, Ontario.*

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What relation are they to the woman in Canada?

The CHAIRMAN: Sister and brother-in-law with seven children.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are they married?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They will not get in, no matter how extreme their case.

The CHAIRMAN: My first letter from Mr. Jolliffe was to the effect that they had no examination port in Hungary.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They cannot come in under the present regulations.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know what the view of the committee would be, but I think that if these people are in the American displaced persons zone we should be able to enter into an arrangement between the Canadian government and the American government to bring certain of those persons here.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That is the problem at the present time; the government will not let them in.

The CHAIRMAN: The other problem is their being Hungarian Germans.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not think we should act too quickly.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We should not deal with specific cases. If we wish to act, I have a hundred files in my office upstairs, and every one of them is heart rending like the one mentioned by the chairman. We must not get into individual cases. I may say that there has been apparently a change in the methods of administration in our immigration department. In years gone by one could go to that department and have each case considered on its own merits. They would ask, "Is it a good immigrant or not a good immigrant?" If he was satisfactory and it was in the interests of Canada to bring him here, there was a special Order in Council passed to do so. But to-day our immigration department is very much like a slot machine. If you put in the right coin you get the right answer. It acts on an automaton as to whether these people come within the strict rule of the immigration regulations. If they do not, you are wasting your wind.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we do not go into specific cases this morning. We should hear the evidence, and have Mr. Jolliffe here and let him tell us what the regulations are.

The CHAIRMAN: Here are some regulations submitted to me by Mr. Jolliffe only yesterday: "In the first place they are citizens of Hungary and thus enemy aliens. The admission of enemy aliens is prohibited by the regulations."

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I believe I have had as much to do with individual cases over the last eight years as have even the lawyer members of this committee. We had a few cases of German citizens, and according to the Immigration Department, if their records are satisfactory they become eligible if they are within the provisions of the regulations concerning relations.

Hon. Mr. EULER: They can always make a special case by Order in Council.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes. I should like to say that yesterday I received a letter from Miss Constance Hayward, Executive Secretary of the Canadian National Committee on Refugees, who is now on the invitation of the inter-governmental Committee visiting Germany and waiting to go into Austria. She said there was great excitement in the camps over the fact that there were some to be admitted to Canada. But she added that roughly it would not amount to more than six or eight from each of those camps. She also mentioned that the particular camp that she had visited the day before had been turned over to UNRRA, to what I think they call "UNRRA Officers Class II" which is the D.P.'s; and they were handling that camp and doing it very satisfactorily. She said that it showed how even under very difficult conditions these people, given a little opportunity, could look after things in a satisfactory manner.

I thought perhaps we could arrange for Miss Hayward to come before the committee, as she will be back in Canada next month. She is now abroad as a representative, I believe, of the Canadian Council of Churches, the Ecumenical Congress which is taking place at Copenhagen.

May I say how interested I was in Denmark's golden example, as appeared by the *Christian Science Monitor* of March 21. With regard to people who have been taken from Germany to Denmark for labour, though they would like



to be rid of this tremendous load, these people are being treated as well as possible, and they are being treated with some understanding and on principles other than those of Nazism.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, may we deal with this motion before the committee adjourns.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour beg leave to make their second report, as follows:

In connection with the order of reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc., the Committee recommend that it be authorized to print 1,000 copies in English and 200 copies in French of its day to day proceedings, and that Rule 100 be suspended in relation to the said printing.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Before we leave I would like to draw attention to the excellent attendance in committee this morning. I do suggest that when we meet again honourable senators come and make a go of the work of the committee.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I should like to say that I attempted to get copies of the proceedings of the committee last session in French, but was unable to secure them.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I think all honourable senators appreciate what Senator Roebuck has done in giving the appropriate publicity through the press of the work of this committee. A remark was made by Senator Campbell about some experience he had in contacting people in the United Kingdom. I spent a little time in that country during the war, and I found many people talking about Canada; I would say five to one. Since I came home to Canada I have had letters from these people expressing disappointment with conditions over there. There are many, many who look to Canada as the future of the Empire—the future of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I think that there are a great number in the United Kingdom who feel that they must go to some other part of the Empire, and they naturally look to Canada. These people are interested in becoming Canadian citizens, and there would not be the problem connected with their entry into Canada that there would be with the persons from the Displaced Persons Camps.

They would like to make their future homes in this country. I think, Senator Roebuck, if you would delve into that situation as much as you can, we may be able to get something started. All these other problems which have been referred to are difficult. It is very difficult to bring residents of continental Europe into this country; so many problems have to be considered. But I can see very little to prevent a suitable Britisher from the United Kingdom, a good citizen, being brought in and given a chance to start a new life in Canada. I would not want to urge anything too drastic, because the British people are having a hard time and, I understand, are not altogether favourable to the emigration of too large a number of their citizens. But I do not believe that Canada was ever in a better position to receive suitable immigrants, suitable new Canadians, than at the present time. Our future depends upon our ability to evolve an immigration policy which will be broad and fair to these people and to Canada and the Empire as a whole. A great future awaits us.

The CHAIRMAN: Two days a week are reserved for the meetings of this committee when we return at the end of April. They will be held at room 368. I take it that the subcommittee will arrange to get the necessary witnesses to come before the committee on those occasions.

The Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.







n.Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Senate Immigration Dept. Library  
Standing Committee No. 1347

1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

# Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 2

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

- Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines  
and Resources.  
Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister, Department of Mines  
and Resources.

### APPENDICES:

- A. Copy of Order in Council P.C. 695, dated 21st March, 1931.  
B. Copy of Order in Council P.C. 2071, dated 28th May, 1946.  
C. Copy of Order in Council P.C. 371, dated 30th January, 1947.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947





## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 23rd April, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 A.M.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, *Chairman*; Burchill, Campbell, Crerar, Daigle, David, Euler, Ferland, Haig, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor and Wilson.—14.

The Committee proceeded to the consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Sénate were in attendance.

Mr. A. L. Joliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources, was heard, and read a prepared statement on the operation and administration of the Immigration Act and the organization of the Department outside of Canada for examination of prospective immigrants into Canada, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Joliffe filed copy of Orders in Council P.C. 695, dated 21st March, 1931, P.C. 2071, dated 28th May, 1946, and P.C. 371, dated 30th January, 1947, with respect to the classes and occupations of immigrants admissible to Canada, which were ordered to be printed in the record.

Mr. Joliffe undertook to furnish for the information of Members of the Committee a statement showing the racial origin and country of residence of immigrants who entered Canada during the year 1946.

Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister, Department of Mines and Resources, was heard, and gave an outline of the efforts now being made to secure shipping space for prospective immigrants to Canada from the United Kingdom and Europe, and the facilities of the Department overseas for examination of immigrants to Canada, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

At 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the Committee adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, 24th April, instant, at 10.30 A.M.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, we have a quorum and I think we might now proceed. As one distinguished senator has intimated, he wanted to get away rather early. Now, we have with us this morning Mr. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, and Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, recently appointed Deputy Minister, Department of Mines and Resources, who is also interested in the immigration question. Now, if there are no objections, we will hear from Mr. Jolliffe first.

Witness: Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I have prepared a statement in accordance with your suggestion which, with your permission, I shall now read.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand there are not sufficient copies for us all to have one now, but we will have it in the record a little later.

Mr. Jolliffe:

### STATEMENT OF A. L. JOLLIFFE

#### DIRECTOR OF IMMIGRATION

In giving evidence before this Committee on May 21, 1946, I described in some detail the organization of the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources and explained its functions. I also dealt with the provisions of the Immigration Act, particularly relating to the authority on which the regulations governing the admission of immigrants is based, the classes of persons both admissible and prohibited, the procedure for admission, rejection, deportation and right of appeal from a rejection or deportation order. As this information is on record, I presume you will not desire that the same be furnished again.

Perhaps it will be useful if I briefly summarize the immigration situation as it existed early last year and then record the developments of the ensuing eleven months. It will be recalled that from 1930 the number of immigrants admitted to Canada each year steadily decreased due to the depression and the changes made in the regulations necessitated by the general economic conditions. During the first four years of the war overseas immigration practically ceased. All this time the regulations provided for the admission of British subjects as specifically defined, United States citizens from the United States, the wife and unmarried child under 18 years of age of residents of Canada, agriculturalists with funds intending to farm in Canada.

Following the cessation of hostilities the primary activities of the Immigration Branch and other government agencies concerned with the movement of people to Canada from overseas were directed toward the return of Canadians

who had been held in the United Kingdom for long periods owing to lack of ocean transportation, the bringing forward of the bulk of servicemen's dependents from the British Isles and the Continent, and the repatriation of Canadians from territory freed of enemy control. These movements, together with the return of service personnel, required the use of all the available shipping until early in the present year. The movement of 65,000 dependents of servicemen was in itself a considerable task.

While these various undertakings were being carried out, plans were formulated for the movement of immigrants when this could commence. The initial action was a widening of the regulations to include in the admissible classes certain additional relatives of residents of Canada. Order in Council P.C. 2071, dated May 28, 1946, provided for the admission of the father or mother, the unmarried son or daughter 18 years of age or over, the unmarried brother or sister, the orphan nephew or niece under 16 years of age of any legal resident of Canada.

Recognizing that lack of transportation, the chaotic condition of rail travel in Europe and the strict frontier controls between countries would prevent for some time any appreciable immigrant movement, the Minister on May 29 when announcing in the House of Commons the extending of the admissible classes of immigrants, directed attention to the fact that while every effort was being made to complete the movements just referred to, it undoubtedly would be the end of the year before much accommodation would be available for the ordinary traveller.

The next step taken was to provide immigration inspectional facilities on the European Continent. Immediately prior to the war Canadian Immigration inspectors and medical officers examined immigrants at Paris, France; Antwerp, Belgium; Rotterdam, Holland; Hamburg, Germany and Gdynia, Poland, but in the early post-war period it was not possible nor was it necessary to re-establish all of these points of inspection. Last summer authority was obtained from the Belgian, French and Netherlands governments to re-establish Canadian inspectional offices in these countries and immigration staffs were assigned to them in November, 1946. Provision was also made for the granting of immigrant visas at Canadian Missions so that at the present time immigrants can be examined in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Portugal and Greece, in addition to the three countries already named. With the expected opening of a Canadian Legation in Warsaw within the next two or three months, immigrants will also be able to obtain immigration visas in Poland. Thus at the present time immigrants can be examined in eleven European countries as compared with five countries prior to the war. The reason for this expansion of inspectional facilities is the fact that prior to the war immigrants could freely travel from their country of residence to embarkation points for immigration examination, while under present conditions they cannot move from one country to another en route to Canada without having first obtained a Canadian immigration visa as evidence of admissibility to this country.

It has not been possible as yet to provide for immigration inspection in enemy countries other than to a limited extent in Germany. Normal immigration activities cannot yet function in Germany, this country being under military control. The problem of dealing with displaced persons in Germany has been met by the use of the facilities available to the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. Arrangements were made with this international organization for their staffs to locate in Germany and later in Austria displaced persons in these countries admissible to Canada under existing regulations whose relatives in this country have made application for their admission. The IGCRC contacts the prospective immigrants, provides for their preliminary medical examination

and moves them to selected points of concentration where they can be examined by Canadian immigration teams now operating in Germany. Following the issuance of immigration visas, transportation to Canada is arranged by the IGCR. This procedure has been necessarily slow at its commencement. Difficulties causing delays in individual cases have been experienced—for instance, immigrants stated by their relatives in Canada to be in certain concentration camps had moved therefrom before they could be contacted and considerable time elapsed before they were located. However, the machinery is now working more smoothly.

On January 30 last by Order in Council P.C. 371, the regulations were further widened providing for the admission of farm labour, and persons experienced in mining, lumbering and logging when destined to assured employment. Provision was also made to admit the widowed daughter or sister, (with or without unmarried children under 18 years of age) of legal residents of Canada, and to raise the age of orphan nephews and nieces admissible from "under 16" to "under 18".

I should like to file with your Committee copies of the Orders in Council referred to above, i.e., P.C. 2071 dated the 28th of May, 1946, and P.C. 371 dated the 30th January, 1947, also a consolidation of P.C. 695 as amended which describes the admissible classes of immigrants, including those in the Orders in Council I have just mentioned.

The Immigration Branch and the Department of Labour are actively engaged in determining the labour requirements in agriculture, mining, lumbering and logging with a view to bringing to Canada from Continental Europe immigrants in these classes where it is established their services are required. The matter of the admission of domestic servants is also under consideration. It is not possible to select immigrants in many countries at present; the main source of supply for any bulk movement of the classes of labour admissible under the regulations is displaced persons in occupied territory.

The chief obstacle to an extensive immigration movement this year is still the matter of ocean transportation. While it is not possible to accurately estimate the number of British subjects in the United Kingdom who are awaiting the opportunity to proceed to Canada, it is certain that the number coming forward will be limited only by the steamship accommodation and not by any lack of prospective British immigrants. The transportation situation is extremely disappointing and every effort is being made to obtain the release of additional ships for the Canadian service to supplement those known to be available for the Canadian route this year.

While this statement has necessarily been a brief outline of the general immigration situation in so far as immigration from Europe is concerned, I hope the same will be of assistance to this Committee in its study of the complicated immigration problem.

I have brought twenty-five copies of the regulations as just mentioned as being consolidated, if they would be helpful to the committee.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They will.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: And I have several copies of the mimeographed Act as well.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You mentioned some effort being made to obtain shipping in order to supplement that already in service. Can you give us any information as to what the picture is prior to the supplementing; what is the picture now with regard to shipping?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The picture at the present time with regard to shipping is that there are only two vessels from the United Kingdom that will be in regular service this summer, the Cunard liner *Ascania* and the Canadian Pacific liner *Empress of Canada*. The *Aquitania* which has been used for troop service and later in the handling of the dependents is still operating to Halifax, and I believe it is planned to operate her for one or two more trips.



Hon. Mr. HAIG: Where is it going then?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I do not know, sir.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: To Australia?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I do not know, officially; I only know what has appeared in the press, where it was proposed that she go to Australia; but there were some statements made later that that idea had been abandoned or had fallen through. She is due, I believe to be scrapped.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It seems remarkable to scrap a ship that will float at all, due to the shortage. It is claimed in the press that she is uneconomical and it takes too much to run her. It seems to me that that is a remarkable reason for scrapping a ship at this time. She served throughout the war, and she is now in service.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The last report of her was in connection with the tremendous storm which she went through a couple of days ago, in which storm a number of people were injured due to the very high velocity of the wind; and the report said however, that the ship herself was uninjured. You have told us that two ships are now directly engaged?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, they will be; they are now being refitted and it is expected that they will be in service in May; but there has been a delay for some reason, and I believe they will not be ready for about a month later.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What boats are in operation now?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The *Aquitania* and one other small ship that has been operating.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And has that been the total passenger equipment as between Canada and Great Britain?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Right.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: For all passengers?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is, between Canadian ports and British ports?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then, there is the shipping that goes from British ports to the United States.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right, there is the *Queen Elizabeth*. And the *Mauretania* will, I believe, soon be operating, and there will be a certain movement to Canada of immigration traffic by both those vessels; but the immediate accommodation available is extremely small. I presume that cost would enter into the factor of using smaller vessels.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And there is some traffic by air, too?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, there is some traffic by air, that is, immigration traffic, I mean.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will be having the steamship companies here, too, I think, who will probably give us the authoritative information as to what they are doing; but at the present moment, your department is dependent on the number of men and women who can be carried?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Has the department ever considered renting the *Aquitania* and using it?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That really is not a departmental matter; that is a matter more of government policy.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And you have never been asked to give any opinion on that question?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: It seems to me that is what you have to face.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I understand that Australia has made arrangements with Great Britain to have a battleship assigned for the carrying of immigrants from Great Britain to Australia. But there is nothing like that going on here?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: How do immigrants arrange for transportation; is it left up to the individual immigrant to get here the best way he can through the companies?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes; the department is in no way responsible for obtaining transportation for an individual immigrant. And so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the only two things that have to be done are: first, to acquire transportation, and secondly, to have his medical examination and come forward.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And must they be British subjects?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, British subjects in the United Kingdom admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Not just anybody in the United Kingdom?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No; but any admissible immigrant in the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with the Polish farm helpers, is not the government paying their transportation?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes; you are referring to the Polish movement. That has been a movement separate and distinct, from the admission of immigrants. These Polish people are agricultural workers who were in the Polish forces in Italy and they were removed to the United Kingdom in order to assist in agricultural work, in view of the shortage of agricultural workers. Then arrangements were made whereby Canada would take 4,000 of these Polish ex-veterans. The question of transportation has been raised, and we found what actually happened was this; that these veterans were being moved from Italy to the United Kingdom, and the only problem involved in the transportation was the changing of the ship from Italy to Liverpool, let us say, or from Italy to Halifax. In other words, transport was available, transport for troops, the transportation end of it. So men were sent to Italy in order to select the men according to the standards set up for agricultural workers; and there were, approximately, twenty-nine hundred of them available then. Others had moved to the United Kingdom and these people were brought to Canada last fall, the twenty-nine hundred, leaving a balance of eleven hundred, approximately.

The CHAIRMAN: Did these twenty-nine hundred have wives or families at all?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, most of them were single men.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Were any of them married?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I do not think so, Senator.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Anyway, you do not know about any wives or families?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, they were to be single men.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then I suppose that applies to those in England whom they are examining now. It appears that officials of the Immigration Department are leaving in a few days by air. Is there something in that report?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not officials of the Immigration Department; officials of the Labour Department and they are now over there. I think they arrived a day or so ago.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: What examination did these twenty-nine hundred undergo before they were brought here to Canada?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: They were examined as to fitness in farm work, and there was a medical examination to establish their medical and physical fitness.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Have they turned out to be medically all right since they got here?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: A number of them were found after arrival to be medically unfit for immediate work.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Where are these people now?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: They are now in hospital; I believe, somewhere in the vicinity of Brandon.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And who is paying the expenses of that medical care?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I cannot answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN: What hospitals are they in?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I believe they are in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: At Brandon; and who is going to pay for them? At the present time you want the provincial government to pay for them.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I cannot answer that.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Who can answer it?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Obviously this witness cannot.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think I am entitled to know. It was his department that brought them to this country, so it may be that he can tell me where to get the answer. He ought to know. He is one of the high officials of the Immigration Department. Do you say you have no control over it, Mr. Jolliffe?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The movement is under the direction of the Department of Labour.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Then you have no control over it at all?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, we have no control over the movement by the Department of Labour.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Then we will have to get the Labour Department here.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I understand they are suffering from tuberculosis and that is a very dangerous thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McNamara's representative will be here to-morrow. Mr. McNamara himself is unable to come, but his representative will be here.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: In the selection of these people, that was done by the Labour Department?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And the Immigration Department's part of the transaction was to see that they came within the proper regulations, medical and otherwise?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And who paid their expenses, the British government?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, I believe so.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Do you know how many of them were medically unfit when they finally came here?

The CHAIRMAN: He has said about 70.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: It finally developed to 70; they were ex-rayed after their arrival in Canada, and there was a number of them of whom there was some suspicion, in fact, a number larger than 70; but the official examinations brought the number down to approximately 70.



Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And at the present time you say there are a couple of teams from the Labour Department who have gone over to "vet" some more of them?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is, solely on the basis of agricultural labour?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Correct.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Can you tell us as to the standard of agricultural labour, how these Poles come within such a definition?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Well, he would have to be an experienced agricultural worker. The representatives of the Department of Labour who were overseas last fall and who are now overseas, will examine these men individually in order to establish that they are experienced farm workers.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Well, they may meet a good husky looking fellow with a strong back and good physique and they may say: did you have agricultural experience? And the fellow who wants to get out of Britain, will say: Oh, yes; I am a farmer. Now, how can they really tell?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is a difficult question to answer.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think you had better ask the Labour Minister.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I am now coming to another point.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: You had better come to it, because this witness does not know.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: My point is this, and I raise it more for the department than for Mr. Jolliffe, because, after all, Mr. Jolliffe is an official of the Department of Immigration, he is Director of that branch; and may I pay this tribute to him here, in this committee, because we were associated for several years, together. He is a very efficient official.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That would be supported unanimously in this committee.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: But after all, Mr. Jolliffe's job is to carry out the regulations that he is given. What the proper questions of policy are, are quite beyond his power, although he may advise upon them, if his advice is asked. But the point I am making is this: I think the matter of restricting this help to Poles, in the way of having them come within some definition of the Labour Department and what constitutes an agriculturist is too narrow altogether. Not only do we need people on our farms, but we certainly need them in our mines in this country.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And in our lumber work.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: There is a very definite shortage, indeed, in the lumber work and there is presently, in the province of Manitoba, from which the Hon. Mr. Haig and myself come, a demand for personnel on the part of the sugar beet growers, and they do not know where they are going to get them at the present time. And although this is not a question upon which Mr. Jolliffe can give an opinion, yet I think the definition is altogether too narrow, for that purpose; so I would like to get a little information, Mr. Jolliffe, on the position of these displaced people in the occupied areas, say, in Germany and also as to the refugees and the expellants in those zones. As I understand it, the first category of displaced persons, is constituted mainly from those who were forcibly taken for slave labour from parts of Russia, Lithuania and Poland that Germany over ran in the early period of the war. They have been away from their homes for years; the majority of them, or perhaps all of them, probably do not wish to return to the countries from which they came, say Poland or the Baltic countries, because the Baltic countries are under a form of government they do not like, and so is Poland. And therefore they constitute a real problem.



And in that group I understand are a very considerable number of Mennonites and Lutherans, and of racial origins, Ukrainians, Poles and so forth. Then there are the refugees, which constitute a rather different category, although not different; they are the people who were driven out of Poland, for instance, after the German invasion of Russia, and the over-running. No, I am wrong, after the arrangement of the treaty that was made between Russia and Germany in the summer of 1939; there was a very large number of people from Lithuania and Estonia.

The CHAIRMAN: And Latvia.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes, who were of German origin; but under that arrangement they were moved by Germany and settled in Poland which had been over-run. I am sorry. This was in the summer of 1940, over-run by Germany in the autumn before. That constitutes one class. Then there were the Germans who were expelled by Russia from these areas and who constitute refugees in the occupied zone. Then there were the Sudeten Germans whom I think, rather harshly the present Czech government expelled from Sudetenland where they had been loyal to the Sudeten government, pre-war or not. Then there were those in the portion of territories that have been allotted to Poland, east of the Oder. I understand that the Poles pushed them out. Then there are the Ukrainians of various racial origins. It is a hodge-podge of people. I understand there is a basis for screening those people for their ideology and I understand that the vast majority of them are anti-Communists and anti-Fascists. But our immigration regulations are not flexible enough to admit them to this country except under these very narrow regulations that the government has laid down as a policy to guide you. Is it possible to provide machinery whereby to examine these people medically, should the government change its regulations?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The refugee problem as presented to the department is the admission of refugees or displaced persons, who come within the regulations as laid down. We deal with those refugees or displaced persons who are admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Quite.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: And the only possible way we have to deal with them, up to the present, is through an organization that is functioning in occupied territory at the present time, that is, the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. With the help of that organization we can get these people to certain points to have them treated, shall I say, and medically examined, that is, medically examined by our own medical officers. That puts them in a position to be moved to Canada, if and when there is transportation to move them.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Now, technically, the displaced persons do not come under the Inter-Governmental Committee for Refugees?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Some do and some do not; but if you will pardon me, I was going to follow that up and really answer your question. What I wanted to do, was to prepare the ground for it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry; will you kindly proceed.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I see no reason why, in answer to your question why machinery, so far as immigration is concerned, for the medical and civil examination of these people cannot be increased in order to take care of larger numbers; and I think that was the point you were getting at.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That was the point; in other words, the important thing is government policy. Now, if the government enlarged its policy and said: for example, Canadians have a knowledge of Mennonites; Mennonites have invariably made good citizens in this country and therefore the Canada government would say, so far as Mennonites are concerned, again using just an illus-

tration: we will admit them to Canada where they conform to the requirements, physical and mental. If the government decided on that policy, could you provide the machinery to facilitate that policy?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That has nothing whatever to do with you, how these people get here. I am opposed to assistance to immigration as far as Canada is concerned; but I feel very strongly that our regulations are altogether too narrow to-day and that they should be broadened and enlarged. Now, the information I would like to have, Mr. Jolliffe, is this: If they were broadened and enlarged, you could provide the machinery for the medical examinations and then leave them to themselves and their friends to find their way to Canada.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I was going to ask how many, so far, have gone through that routine and have been examined and shipped; first examined and next shipped; how many have we had?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: There are over, approximately, 50 arrived. The first group arrived recently, 50.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And that was on the *Aquitania*?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Oh, as to the actual number that have been examined, I am sorry, but I am unable to say.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But is the examination going forward?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The examination is going forward and the teams are in Germany. The difficulties that we are faced with in this thing and the slowness of this thing have been due to the fact that a lot of the applicants really do not know where their relatives live, where they are located; and they furnished the department with addresses and some of them were incomplete, while others were absolutely incorrect at the moment we got to them. Some of these people were moved from one camp to another, or released from a camp and the relatives in Canada had not been furnished with the information as to the change of address; and that would mean that the representative of the Inter-Government committee who had been furnished with the information and so on, as to the address, and who tried to locate these people, would find that a man had gone; and in some cases he would find that it would take him weeks to find out where the man was; so that has been one of the chief reasons for holding the thing up. There have been some cases where the man has been located and he was not just then ready to leave or to go to the concentration point because he had some other relative there that he thought he would like to have brought along with him and that he would prefer to wait until this other fellow had his turn come up. You see, there are all kinds of human problems involved in this thing, which, unfortunately, do not push the thing forward, but rather they push it backward.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Would they operate from concentration camps in Germany?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not necessarily, sir. Some of those people are at private addresses in different parts of Germany, and that also is one of the difficulties, because these people are scattered all over the country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How do you do it? Do you notify them to come to an office or to a certain point?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, the Inter-Governmental Committee arrange a concentration point where officers examine them. It would be impossible to send officers all over Germany. The applications are filed in Canada and they are centred in the head office, the Immigration Head Office; and the particulars are placed on master lists. These master lists are given to the Inter-Governmental Committee. At the same time, the investigation is being conducted in Canada into

the settlement conditions for the prospective immigrants. The master list is in the hands of the Inter-Governmental Committee in London and is supplied to the various agencies in Germany to locate these people. Immediately the settlement conditions are established in Canada, a secondary list is sent over, with the corresponding number, to the people who are passed. That is connected with the master list, and the officials in Germany, who have located these people, are then in a position to say: go to such and such a concentration point for your examination. That, in brief, is the machinery. It is quite simple, and, so far as we are aware, it is the only possible way of dealing with it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Can you give us any idea of how many are on the master list, and how many have been approved?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I cannot give you those figures in detail; there are approximately 5,000 cases now on the master list.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you give a priority to those who have relatives, or is that master list composed of those for whom application has been made in Canada?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes; these are relatives. Now, there are, in addition to that, others who would be admissible under the category of displaced persons. There are a number of applications filed in the department for admission of sugar beet workers. A number of these people are relatives of residents of Canada, relatives of the applicant, and they are agricultural workers or are supposed to be. Those people are admissible as farm labourers under the regulations, if it be established that there is employment available for them in Canada. A number of those applications include people who are in displaced areas, so that these can be dealt with in exactly the same manner as the relatives are, but they are not relatives within the admissible classes, as you asked.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: What countries are they from; they are not all from Germany?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: You mean, the sugar beet workers?

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Yes, the sugar beet workers.

Hon. Mr. JOLLIFFE: Some are from Holland, some from Belgium, and some from Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Mr. EULER: To what extent does the relationship apply, brothers and sisters and what?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Brothers, sisters, mother, father, son, daughter, widow when unmarried, and children under eighteen years of age; brother and sister. I should say, single, not married.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Does it go to nephews and nieces?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Orphan nephews and nieces under eighteen years of age.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Before one of these immigrants can come to Canada, he must have a degree of relationship with someone in Canada?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is, if he is not admissible on the grounds of occupation.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is one condition; and the next condition is: he must have an assurance of work in Canada?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is not quite true, sir. First of all, a person is admissible on the grounds of relationship; that is, if he comes within the clause of relationship which I have just mentioned.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Then assured employment is not required in that regard; the condition is that he shall be a relation within that degree of relationship who is a resident of Canada, and that the resident of Canada should be in a



position to receive and care for him. That is a condition. The other clause, that of farm labourer, is not that he should have a relative, but that he should be assured of farm employment.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But he may be a relative?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is that only with regard to displaced persons.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, that is general.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is no category of displaced persons, is there?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, insofar as admissible persons are concerned.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: My point is, however, that these regulations are altogether too narrow and restricted. For example, it is well known that the Mennonite people in Canada and the United States have been supporting and sending food and clothing to a very considerable number, if my information is correct, to about one hundred thousand Mennonites in the occupied zones in Germany, mainly in the American and British zones, and they have been doing that for at least the last two years. Yet, during the last year, as you will probably know, Mr. Jolliffe, the Mennonite fraternity in the United States and Canada wanted to bring a substantial number of the Mennonites into Canada, and they agreed to finance them. As a matter of fact, the regulations were so restrictive that they could not do it. So, within the last four months, they chartered a ship, the *Volodam*, at a cost of \$375,000 and sent twenty-three hundred of these Mennonites to Paraguay and South America.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Why didn't they send them to Canada?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And they provided the means to get them established in South America under supervision. My point is: that because of the restrictiveness of our regulations, these people were prevented from coming to Canada. If the regulations had permitted them to come to Canada—and it is not Mr. Jolliffe's fault—these Mennonites could have come to Canada and they would have disappeared when they arrived on our shores, into Mennonite homes out in Manitoba, where there are a very large number of them, and they would have been available, for instance, to work in our sugar-beet fields this spring, out in Manitoba. So it does seem to me that our regulations are altogether too restrictive. Let me repeat, again: it is not Mr. Jolliffe's fault; it is a matter of government policy.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: I would like to see the restrictiveness removed and let us say, good citizens whether Lutheran, Mennonite or any other class whether anti-Nazi or anti-Communist; and they can be screened for their ideologies; that can be done, I am sure. I do not see why we cannot admit substantial numbers of those people into Canada where they can find employment in the mines, in the woods and in all sorts of occupations. My protest is that the policy is too narrow and restrictive.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: How many immigrants or displaced persons were admitted into Canada in 1946?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I cannot give any breakdown of displaced persons; but the number of immigrants admitted in 1946 was 71,719.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Does that number include soldiers' dependents?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And they would number 65,000.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I think the move in 1946 of soldiers' dependents would run from 35,000 to perhaps 40,000; those figures are subject to correction.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Were they all from Europe?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: All these immigrants?



Hon. Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: There were 71,000 altogether.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: How many came from Britain of that 71,000?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Approximately 50,000.

Hon. Mr. EULER: How many came from the States?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: There were 11,469 from the United States. I am sorry but I have not got them from the countries of origin; I have them here as to racial origin.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Something over 60,000 came from Britain and the United States.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: Could the members of the committee have a copy of those figures?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are those figures not in the report?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, not for this year. I could have a statement prepared of statistics in any form that you want; I could give it by nationality or by race or by country of last permanent residence.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That would be best.

The CHAIRMAN: Do that, if you will, please.

Hon. Mr. EULER: You do not know how many came in from the other European countries; could you give us the breakdown on that?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I am sorry but I have it here only by origin.

Hon. Mr. EULER: That would be racial origin, is that it?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Racial origin, yes.

Hon. Mr. EULER: That would be just about as good.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then let us have it.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I could give you that information.

Hon. Mr. EULER: How many came from Holland, Belgium, Germany?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: It does not state that, but I could give you, for instance, the Dutch race.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: There were 2,431 persons of the Dutch race admitted to Canada; of them 285 came from the United States. That leaves 2,146 from overseas; most of them, no doubt, came from Holland.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Some of them would be war brides.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Some of them would be war brides and soldiers' dependents.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Could you give us the countries of origin and separate the soldiers' dependents from Holland and so on.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, but I could give you the total number of soldiers' dependents altogether.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Very well, give us that; that would be something.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Soldiers' dependents were largely from Britain were they not?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, sir; probably the majority of them were; I do not suppose there would be 2,000 or 3,000 from other countries.

Hon. Mr. EULER: You could give us the racial origins, say, from Holland, Belgium, Germany and Poland.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I could.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Have you got them with you now?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, for 1946.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I have them.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: How many Mennonites were included in that 71,000?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: They do not show here as Mennonites; they show as racial origins.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Give us the numbers according to racial origin.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The total, not separated from the United States and from overseas, but the total.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Yes.

Mr. JOLLIFFE:

### IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, SHOWING RACIAL ORIGIN, FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1946

	Via Ocean Ports	From U.S.A.	Totals
Albanian .....	..	2	2
Armenian .....	11	1	12
Belgian .....	724	27	751
Bohemian .....	13	18	31
British			
English .....	38,370	3,827	42,197
Irish .....	3,218	1,414	4,632
Scotch .....	8,647	1,562	10,209
Welsh .....	1,173	121	1,294
Bulgarian .....	..	3	3
Chinese .....	8	..	8
Croatian .....	4	6	10
Czech .....	187	20	207
Dalmatian .....	1	..	1
Dutch .....	2,146	285	2,431
East Indian .....	4	1	5
Estonian .....	8	..	8
Finnish .....	22	34	56
French .....	1,767	1,462	3,229
German .....	449	849	1,298
Greek .....	61	47	108
Hebrew .....	1,517	583	2,100
Italian .....	145	175	320
Japanese .....	1	2	3
Jugo-Slav .....	16	18	34
Lettish .....	5	1	6
Lithuanian .....	19	9	28
Magyar .....	83	69	152
Maltese .....	12	..	12
Mexican .....	2	1	3
Moravian .....	1	..	1
Negro .....	125	48	173
North American Indian .....	10	27	37
Persian .....	2	1	3
Polish .....	565	165	730
Portuguese .....	38	9	47
Roumanian .....	19	25	44
Russian .....	154	59	213
Ruthenian .....	114	57	171

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, SHOWING RACIAL ORIGIN, FOR THE  
CALENDAR YEAR 1946—*Con.*

	Via Ocean Ports	From U.S.A.	Totals
Scandinavian—			
Danish .....	83	85	168
Icelandic .....	15	9	24
Norwegian .....	269	187	456
Swedish .....	86	145	231
Serbian .....	5	13	18
Slovak .....	5	14	19
Spanish .....	48	1	49
Spanish American .....	9	12	21
Swiss .....	72	48	120
Syrian .....	11	26	37
Turkish .....	6	1	7
Totals .....	60,250	11,469	71,719

The CHAIRMAN: That is the total admission in 1946.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is the total admission for the calendar year 1946; that is, the total was 71,719.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I thought that the Russians did not let anybody out at all.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: This means the Russian race, not the Russian personalities.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They may have come from the United States.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right; as a matter of fact, 59 of those of the Russian race are United States citizens.

Hon. Mr. EULER: This shows more than 1,000 of the German race; did many of them come from the United States?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Probably they did; I cannot answer that question at the moment until we get the other statement that you are asking for.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is the situation in Italy; have we got an immigration office there?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not yet, sir.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I understand, over a year back, that you were going to send a team to Italy.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: These teams are operating in Germany now.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There are no teams in Italy?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not yet.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: We are still at war with Italy, are we not?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, perhaps technically.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: I think it is technical enough to suit the Immigration Department.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Most of the people in Italy who would come within the purview of our regulations are of enemy alien citizenship, and enemy aliens are not admissible.

Hon. Mr. EULER: You are letting the relatives of those who are in Canada come in, even if they are of enemy citizenship.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The regulations provide for it.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Even though they are of that citizenship.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: That would include immigrants from say Italy, Hungary, Austria, Germany and all such countries?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Roumania and Finland.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless they could advise the Minister of Mines and Resources that they were opposed to the war, they are debarred from coming to Canada, no matter what they have put up with.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Isn't that carrying on the war? I thought the war was over.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: But the peace treaty has not yet been signed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Will this continue after the peace treaty has been proclaimed? The order in council would then become inactive would it not?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I cannot say.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is no limitation in the order in council as to how long it will apply, that anybody in the group who fought in the war is not admissible.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: A farmer in Hungary or Italy would have a tough time to prove to you that he was opposed to the governments of his own country.

Hon. Mr. EULER: What sort of proof would you insist upon?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: So far as the actual operation of the thing is concerned, the application for admission of a Bulgarian or an Italian would be rejected because he is an enemy alien. The proof that he was opposed to an enemy government would have to come from him because we could not investigate his case in Italy.

Hon. Mr. EULER: It would be pretty difficult, almost impossible.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, of course.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: I was cut off by some of the other honourable members in my questioning a while ago. You say, Mr. Jolliffe, that your medical department examined these 2,900 Poles?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: And those same medical men are now examining over there, the same type of men.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: They let 70 men through who were suffering from T.B.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is a fact.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Was it only T.B.?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, there were some cases.

The CHAIRMAN: Of venereal disease?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, of venereal disease upon arrival at the port of entry.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: But the 70 are T.B. and the row now is: who will pay the bill; it will be a long bill; T.B. means a long bill.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not necessarily, senator; it all depends on the conditions; I am not a medical man myself, but there are cases of people certified for T.B., who inside of four months are finally certified as being cured.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I have heard it said that only an ex-ray examination of the chest will tell you whether an individual has T.B. in its incipient form; is that true?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is a medical question.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Have you got such ex-ray examinations going on now?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: These people will all be examined.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am interested in the number of young women, Mr. Jolliffe, who have young men that they want to marry. I know of one case where a girl met a flyer in Canada during the war and became engaged to him. When



the flyer was sent to England this girl followed him to England and married him there. Now the Immigration Department has refused to let him come to Canada and the wife also was refused admission. But since I made a statement about it here in the committee a change occurred, so far as the wife is concerned, and I have been advised that she has not forfeited admissibility to Canada when married to an alien and that she could come back and that they were going to examine the husband as well with a view to allowing them to come back. I was very pleased at the change in the department but I have quite a number of these cases. I have a young woman in Canada at the present time whose prospective husband is already in Canada on a visit. She went to New York to meet him and I advised her not to marry him there because they might not let her in again. Is there any latitude or laxity or sweet reasonableness on the part of your department with regard to people of this kind?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Senator, it would be very difficult for me to discuss some individual case here, such as the merits of the case you have mentioned, a particular case.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: No, I did not mention the names and I do not propose to do that; but I could not introduce the subject in any other way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You mentioned that you had taken the case or that there had been a change in the department's attitude. There may have been a change in the department's decision; there may have been a mistake in the individual case, in the original decision that was given to you, and it may have been reviewed and changed. The policy on which those cases should have been based is this: first of all, the law does not admit a male fiancé as such; those are regulations which the officers administer. Secondly, we were faced with this situation: that a number of our Canadian girls during the time that the members of the Allied forces were in Canada, fell in love with some of the lads and became engaged to them. Those men left Canada and served overseas and then went to their own country. I have in mind the Norwegians. As soon as the men went overseas, or rather as soon as they were freed from their service, the girl went over to them. They either went over or married them before they left Canada; so application was made for the re-admission of the men and their wives. Now, in the case of many Canadian girls, they married an alien and thus became aliens and left Canada for permanent residence abroad.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: But that was only up to the first of January when the new Citizenship Bill came into force.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So far as the department was concerned, the application was made for the admission of an alien and his wife and was inadmissible. The policy laid down was this: That where those circumstances were in effect or existed, that provision would be made for the admission of a man and his wife, because any other policy would be virtually saying to a Canadian girl: you are not going to come back to your own country.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: That is all I wanted to know.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is so.

HON. MR. HAIG: She can now come back and bring her husband with her.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, by special action being taken.

HON. MR. HAIG: It is possible to take that action.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes. That has been done and repeated. And there is another class of case where a Canadian girl has not yet married the man. Let us take the case of a Canadian girl engaged to a Pole in the United Kingdom or in Holland or in some other country. She goes over to the country for the purpose of marrying that man and coming back to Canada. That woman is not in the same class as I first mentioned; she does not lose her right to return to Canada

and is re-admissible to Canada as a matter of right, so there is no question of refusing her admission, and she is given admission; and we deal with her husband in the same way as in the first category that I mentioned.

Hon. Mr. EULER: In the case of an immigrant who wants to come to Canada, but who does not meet with the requirements of your regulations, is it possible in any individual case, to obtain admission to Canada by means of an order in council; an exception can be made?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: The only exception that can be made to people not admissible under the regulations, is by order in council. The regulations say that immigrants are not admissible to Canada unless they belong to the following classes. Now, if all orders in council were wiped out to-day or to-morrow, every person would be admissible to Canada if he were in good health and of good character and was not liable to become a public charge.

Hon. Mr. EULER: These regulations are not really statutory?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. EULER: So that is why an order in council can admit them?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I want to clean up this business of the girls and their sweethearts because it is awfully important for them. It may not be so important to our country, although that is important too. Do I understand that if a girl who is locally or legally resident in Canada goes abroad and marries somebody, she does not lose her right to return.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is, unless it is her intention to reside abroad.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, yes; then if she is not a native born Canadian, she loses her citizenship.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes; by her marriage, she becomes an alien. That does not necessarily mean that she is not re-admissible into Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I know. Now, under the Citizenship Act, if she is a Canadian born, she does not lose her Canadian citizenship and she can return to Canada at any time.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: It is not her citizenship that establishes her rights to return to Canada; if she is locally resident in Canada and leaves for a temporary purpose, she has to be re-admitted into Canada as a matter of right. It is not citizenship, it is domicile. She might marry a man overseas, still with the intention of coming back, hoping to bring him back with her.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And you cannot keep her out?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And you do not refuse her?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then, so far as her husband is concerned, I understand that it is the policy of the department to admit him if all conditions are complied with.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: If he is admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: You mean, medically fit?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Not only medically fit, but admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What do you mean by that? Do you mean a farm labourer?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: If he were an Italian or a German he could not come back?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: If he marries a girl, we provide for his admission. That is what I told you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I wanted to be more than clear because there are some girls who are going to act on what you say to-day.

Hon. Mr. EULER: No restrictions at all?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I do not get your point.

Hon. Mr. EULER: If he has married a Canadian girl, be he an Italian, Hungarian or whatever you like, he can then come in without being subject to these various restrictions?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right; of course, he must be in good health and of good character. We waive the present restrictions of law that would otherwise prevent him from coming to Canada.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Then it is a matter of discretion?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Yes, and to-day, generally speaking, that is done by order in council, the waiving of those restrictions which affect him.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am extremely interested because there are girls, and just to cite one case, where they came to see me about it; I know that some girls are going over after this meeting this morning, to marry someone in some other country. It might be in Great Britain, or the United States, or in Europe. Is it possible to arrange in advance so there is no doubt or question, to have a man like that examined and so on, and the wedding take place rather than let us suppose, to allow the girl to marry him and then to find that he has T.B. or something of that kind; then they are in an awful mess. Is it possible to do that?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I think we would have to consider that, Senator; I would not care to give a quick answer.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then you would prefer to consider a specific case?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: We might find that we have got ourselves into the matrimonial business; I do not know.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We are in it and I hope we are never going out of it.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: To clear up this other subject, as long as this order in council is on the books with regard to enemy aliens, for all practical purposes, the people of Italy, Hungary, Austria and so on are not admissible and cannot come to this country as ordinary immigrants?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we have heard from Mr. Jolliffe for a little better than an hour. Is there anything further?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I want to ask one more question: with regard to farm labourers and the mines and so on, I have one instance in mind. I do not mean instance, but rather incident. It may be that an application is made for admission of a lumberman, in that category, and the answer is that while he is admissible under the regulations, conditions are such at the present moment that he cannot be admitted. Now, what is the picture? Are you admitting those people or are you not? I mean those people who are within the category of miners, lumbermen and farmers.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: Well, yes; we are bound to admit people who are admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: If an application is made for the admission of a lumberman and he is coming to assured employment in this country, then he is admissible; but that does not mean to say that somebody says: I have got a job somewhere for some man, that that means assured employment. Assured employment has to be there; he has got to be coming to a job in that particular industry.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I see.



Mr. JOLLIFFE: There are lots of applications; the department is flooded with applications from all over Canada from industrial areas by people who say: I have got a cousin and I will give him a job and I will get a job for him as a miner. Now, that does not meet the requirements of the regulations at all.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It has got to be somebody who is running a mine who has got to say that?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: He has got to be assured of employment by a miner or a mining company.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But if those regulations are satisfied then you have to comply with them?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is our duty.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is anything done about such a case as this? If a man goes into a mine and leaves his job in a week or a month?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: That is an old question; you will pardon me, but rather an old problem, Senator; so far as the law is concerned, if a man complies with the conditions of his entry, there is no further action that we can take in the matter.

Hon. Mr. EULER: They could easily avoid it, if they wanted to.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: If he came to Canada as a miner and then took a job as president of a company, or in some other occupation, he would easily be the subject of deportation proceedings.

Hon. Mr. EULER: No, I mean that if he comes in as a miner, and in good faith enters upon employment as a miner and after a week or so he leaves it; would you follow that up?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But you could deport him; he is subject to deportation, is he not?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: It is very doubtful.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am through now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Jolliffe; we have got a lot of valuable information which I know will be beneficial to the members of the committee and we wish to thank you.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: It has been a pleasure to appear before you.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I was very much interested in Senator Crerar's line of reasoning this morning, which I think is the only reasonable line to take here in Canada at the present time. I am not thinking of anything else; but is it fair to ask this question: Are any discussions taking place at the present time along the lines of Senator Crerar's ideas, that the regulations should be broadened, so that Canada might accept a little fuller share of her responsibility with respect to these displaced persons?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I can answer you in this way, sir, and say: that the question of immigration is under very active review at the present time. That is all I can say.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you any more copies of that consolidation?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: What is that?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of the consolidated report?

Mr. JOLLIFFE: No, but I will be very glad to get some.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean this thing?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, I would like to have half a dozen.

Mr. JOLLIFFE: I brought up twenty-five or thirty and I brought some copies of the Act.



The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we shall invite Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, who has recently been appointed Deputy Minister of the Department of Mines and Resources, to take the stand, and we will try questioning him. I do not imagine that any members of this committee will be unduly resourceful in questioning Dr. Keenleyside, on questions affecting immigration, although, a year from now we hope to have him before us and to be in a position to question him, it may be, more thoroughly; but we would like to have his viewpoint of the immigration question.

The Witness, Mr. A. L. JOLLIFFE retired and Dr. H. L. KEENLEYSIDE took the stand.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be present and to be allowed to attend a meeting of this Senate committee. This is the first time I have had this honour, and if I do not in all ways comply with the proper procedure, I hope you will put it down as ignorance and not to any other cause.

In a letter you were good enough to address to me, you suggested that I attend this morning primarily for the purpose of listening to Mr. Jolliffe's presentation and to inform myself, as a result of the discussion that opens from that. Thus I have not prepared any statement of my own to make in regard to the problem of immigration, but I should like to comment on one or two of the points raised in the discussion with Mr. Jolliffe, and perhaps to supplement what he has already said to you.

First of all, with regard to shipping. Mr. Jolliffe pointed out very clearly the difficulties that we are faced with in that matter. I should like to say, however, that we are doing everything that we can, through the Canadian High Commissioner in London, to ensure that additional shipping facilities are made available, and made available this year. We do not know yet how successful we are going to be in our representations, particularly to the British Ministry of Transport; but we are making representations and we hope that eventually they may result in some benefit.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is the best news we have heard yet.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Then, to submit what was said with regard to the policy of immigration and Senator Haig's questions. First of all, on the matter of screening these immigrants: Something was said as to the matter of their health, but no reference was made to the fact that they are screened also under the Security Act. In other words, we are looking into their record as far as we possibly can, to ascertain that they are not Communists and also that they were not collaborators, in any way, with the Germans, the German regime, fascism, either of the German or Italian or Polish variety.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: What about the police records?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Those are also being obtained.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Do you consider them immigrants? I do not think so.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: They are immigrants in fact, but whether they should be included in the normal immigration movement of this country is a problem.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: So far, evidently they are not aware that we are just bringing them here for certain work, to work on the farm and that we are considering them as to how well they can work, and as Senator Haig has said, what their strength was, and their health. Now, how long are you going to keep them when the person who is taking them now is through with them and is anxious for them to leave the country? We are not taking them for their own good at all, but rather for our own benefit to do the hard work; and we are checking them just as we would check on army horses, to look to see how healthy they are. So, how long are we going to keep them here? They are coming here unmarried,

and we are distributing them across the country and giving them work and seeing to it that they do that work. Do we expect them to stay in Canada for the rest of their lives? If they were immigrants, we would expect them to stay here and we would have to consider what part of the country they were going into, whether they could settle down and become citizens or not; but we are not thinking of that. England is trying to encourage them to go back to Warsaw, but as they themselves know more about it than do the people in England, they do not want to go back to what they would meet here. Most of us are of the opinion that they are showing good judgment. We are obliging England by bringing them here just to do the hard work; but there is no mention from anybody as to how long they are going to stay. If they get out of work, are we going to deport them, and if so, to what country? I think the whole subject is one for the study of this government. We are inviting 4,000 men over here who have done as much as the people of any country, and more, to win the war at a greater cost to themselves and their country, yet, as I say, we are just, so far, arranging to treat them like a lot of horses. I think the government of Canada will have to get a little better vision on the subject. We know that they are not Communists and we know that they are not allies of Germany. They have not the right to be either one or the other and they are not; but they do not dare go back where they came from, yet Britain is too small to keep a couple of hundred thousand soldiers who were brought to Britain for their own salvation; so the British are trying to get rid of them. Canada will have to change its policy with regard to these people. We are looking for immigrants, but we do not get any better immigrants than the Poles. We have an order in council now which was read here to-day, which prevents Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, and Italians, from coming here; and they have, as applicants, Canadian citizens who applied for their release in this country and have been refused and quite properly under that order in council. I think, in suggesting these problems for the government of Canada, I do not know anyone better qualified than you are, Dr. Keenleyside, to see to it that the government of Canada gives the matter some attention.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I greatly fear that the problems you have raised are not ones on which I can comment publicly, at least.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: I do not expect any solution; but I do not know of any better man in the country to see that the government of Canada acts and provides a solution. I think they should get rid of that order in council by means of another order in council. I do not think either of the various nationalities should be kept out of Canada because they were on the other side of the wall. England is bringing Germans and Italians to England to do their work now.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: That is another matter I would like to comment on, but before doing so, I would refer to the fact that Polish soldiers are being screened for security reasons. It is not certain that it was left entirely clear in the minds of the committee with respect to the difficulties that arose in regard to their health. In the first case, those 2,900 who have already come in, it arose from the fact that they were given ex-ray examinations not before they left the other side of the Atlantic, but only after their arrival in Canada. Now, with respect to the 1,100 who are still to come, they are being ex-rayed before they leave England; and in consequence there should be no problem of T.B. in the case of these 1,100 who are now about to be brought forward.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is there any suggestion in the regulations or anywhere else of a limitation as to the time that these Polish boys can stay in Canada?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: No; the only point where time comes into it at all, and I speak subject to correction, is according to my understanding, that they are brought here and found places on farms in this country, and then they are expected to enter into an agreement with whoever takes them on, for I believe, one year's work after that; it may be two years, but I am not sure.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it was two years.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: It may be two years, but I am not sure. In any event the situation, legally, is that after they have carried out the terms of their initial admission, then they are free like anyone else now, so far as their arrival in Canada is concerned.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And they are legally entitled to stay here?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: They are legally entitled to stay here and are not subject to deportation except for reasons which would make them ordinarily deportable.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: And what country could they be deported to?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I am afraid that I am not competent to answer that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I know some Polish girls who are going to marry them; that is to say, I mean Canadian girls in the Polish group; they are going to be married and there will be a lot of trouble if there is any difficulty in that regard. There is not, is there?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I should not think so, at all. We would hope, that after a period of two years, they would have become so accustomed to the Canadian way of life and way of doing things that they would be very anxious to stay here.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They will!

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I was going to make one reference to the matter of enemy aliens. The question was raised, I think, by Senator Roebuck, that when the war is over we would still continue to bar enemy aliens from admission to Canada under the terms of an order in council No. 2071. I think the answer is that when the war is over, there is no such thing as an enemy alien. Secondly, the order in council does not apply, and consequently they would be admissible under the terms of the ordinary immigration act and its terms and regulations; so we can assume when the government declares that the war is over—

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, it has already done that.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Only for certain purposes, as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: But the treaties have not yet been approved.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: No.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: It has been quite a while now since those treaties were signed, but the Parliament of Canada has not approved them as yet, so in the meantime all these people are enemy aliens unless this order in council be set aside.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: My point is that when the war is over the order in council will no longer apply and they come within the terms of the ordinary immigration act and regulations. One other matter. The question was raised as to how we could tell whether individual Germans or Italians had been in opposition to the regime we were fighting in their respective countries. That is, of course, an extremely difficult thing to decide. As, in some cases, and there have been a good many instances of it, if a person can be shown to have been in a concentration camp, or to have had his property confiscated because of opposition to the Hitler regime, then that would be proof that would be accepted by the Immigration branch of his opposition to the Hitler government, and, in consequence, the person in question would be admissible to Canada and not be subject to the terms of that order in council.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: What about the naturalized Canadians who happened to be in an enemy country at the time of war and became conscripted into their army; is there not some provision whereby he can appear before a commission to show that he was conscripted and therefore is protected and permitted to return to Canada?



Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I am afraid that I cannot answer that; but he would be admissible to Canada as a naturalized Canadian, if he could prove to the Canadian authorities that his failure to maintain his Canadian domicile, which would be the operative point, is due to causes over which he had no control. I suppose that enlistment by conscription in a foreign army would be one of those causes.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the Education Department enter into a matter such as that?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: No, not in the ordinary way.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Is there any other federal department that looks after that, in respect to teaching them or providing education?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I am not sure just what has been done by the Secretary of State's office since the Canadian Citizenship Act has been brought into force. I understand that they do make an effort to impress upon the applicants for naturalization something of the characteristics of the country to which they tend to ally themselves. To what extent that has been undertaken, I do not know.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There ought to be some effort. I have heard of a case of two or three who have come here fairly recently from Europe. Unfortunately they said that they thought they were coming to a land of absolute freedom where there were no prejudices or anything.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You'd think they would be mistaken, if they had that idea.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Well they felt it to be a little disquieting in some respects.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: During the war certain steps were taken in connection with the English and Scotch brides of Canadian soldiers. Classes were organized in England under the aegis of the High Commissioner's office there.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think some girls made an effort to do something for them in Toronto.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Now there is something else I would like to speak about although I do not know if it is wholly appropriate here.

The CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Sir.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: One of the problems that faces the department is the organization and operation of the Immigration branch as an effective going concern. As you are all aware, during the period of the depression and then of the war, it was unavoidable that the immigration services should suffer from lack of opportunity to use all of its facilities, because those were periods when immigration was almost at a standstill. Now, with the return of more normal conditions, which we hope will last, it is important that the Immigration branch should be so organized that it will be a flexible instrument for the carrying on of government policy; in other words, an instrument that can be used to stimulate and handle the accelerated movement of immigrants into this country when conditions here make that advisable, and that can be slowed down when conditions here make it inadvisable. The problem therefore is so to organize the branch that it can meet these two phases of government policy. Steps have already been taken under the present Minister of Mines and Resources to move in that direction, and further steps are in prospect. And in that connection I would say that I appreciate very much indeed the reference made by members of the committee to Mr. Jolliffe. I have been in touch with the affairs of the Immigration branch here for the last eighteen years, partly as an agent of the branch when I was stationed abroad and partly through contact with it when I was stationed in Ottawa. I do not think there is any public servant who is more conscientious, careful, and humane than the present Director of the branch.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And you can add: industrious.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Yes, and industrious; and I was very much pleased to find that that was the opinion, and seemed to be the opinion of the members of this committee. The officers of the Immigration branch, as you are all aware, are very often subject to pretty severe criticism, that, to my mind, might almost be described as abuse, by people outside who feel that they are not operating the immigration service as it should be handled and they are not letting in people who should be allowed to come in.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I should like to add two more adjectives: courteous and thoughtful.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I would substantiate both of those; and it is very satisfactory to those of us who are his colleagues to find that his services are being appreciated, and to find that the criticism to which he is sometimes subjected outside is not shared by the members of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We all know that he and the department are doing the best it can under the instructions that they are permitted to carry out.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: That is certainly so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is the instructions that we are complaining about.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I would like to say a word. The Immigration branch suffered pretty severely during the war. There were enlistments from it, and there was practically no immigration. There were certain retirements too. So after six years of war, Dr. Keenleyside and the Minister have a job in reconstructing the department again.

The CHAIRMAN: And we are looking to you, Dr. Keenleyside, to do a real job of "revoluting".

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: It is Dr. Keenleyside's and Mr. Jolliffe's job to carry out the policy and regulations of the government.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: My criticism is that they do it, but they are both sticklers for regulations.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That may be a matter of opinion; I sometimes share that view myself.

The CHAIRMAN: They know there will be a come-back it may be, if they do not do so.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: But the real and crucial thing it seems to me in this whole business, is the widening of opportunities to bring people to this country. I am not much in sympathy with the regulation that: provided everyone must have an assured job before we will admit him. This country is a country with wide opportunities. We know, from our daily observation, that in certain places there is a definite shortage of workers and labourers on farms, in mines, and in the woods; and it is not sufficient answer to say: that a given time in the city of Toronto, or Winnipeg or Vancouver you may have a few thousand people out of work. Those few thousand people won't go into those jobs, or they are not competent to go into them; but there is a deal of work with one's hands that has to be done all over this country; and unquestionably to-day there is a shortage, a very serious shortage of workers of that type. I am among those people who believe that this is definitely retarding the development of this country. And aside from the sordid or practical side, if you like, there is another side to it, the humanitarian side. I equally share the view with those who believe that it is not right for a country with tremendous opportunities such as Canada to adopt a dog-in-the-manger attitude with respect to immigrants from other countries. A big part of the problem in Europe to-day is due to overcrowding and we have here hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of refugees and displaced persons ninety per cent of whom, I am convinced are anti-Communist and anti-Nazi

and who want the democratic way of life and who would think that they had reached heaven if given a chance to come to Canada and to work with their two hands. That states my creed very definitely on this question.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You told us that arrangements were being made with the Transport Department in Great Britain for the allotment of shipping to our needs in this regard. Would that be only from England to Canada; what about Europe?

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: If that is the impression I gave you, then I should modify it slightly by saying that negotiations are under way; I do not know whether arrangements can be made or not, but we are trying to make arrangements. What was your question again?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: My question was that it would help us so far as immigration from Europe is concerned.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: What we would like to have would be additional shipping to handle immigrants from the United Kingdom itself and also from the European continent as well. The great part of our effort at the moment is directed towards screening and developing a movement from the displaced persons areas on the continent, but that is being held up by the fact that there is no shipping available.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The next subject I want to touch on with you is the question of relatives. Many times I have said here and in the House, that the best immigrants that we can possibly have in this country are the relatives of those who are already here and who have established themselves. They are the ones who are most likely to learn most quickly our ways and the Canadian way of life and who are the least likely to become public charges. The very best immigrant possible is somebody born here, and the next best is a relative of somebody who has come here and become established and is in a position to guarantee the success of his relative coming in after him. And there are the other elements on the humanitarian side. Then there are very large numbers—I withdraw the words very large; but there are a number of people in this country who are in keen distress over their brothers and sisters and others in Europe, whom they are unable to bring here for one reason or another; and one of my serious objections to your regulations is that a man must be single; and that if he has committed the sin of marrying somebody, you do not admit him. That to me seems outrageous. I do hope the department is applying its mind to this feature and that it will give to these relatives priority over everything else, industrial requirements included.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a sample of the "revoluting" that we want you to do.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That's right.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I think everyone will agree with Senator Roebuck that the relatives of a person who has already made a success of life in Canada is the most desirable kind of immigrant that we can have; but as to whether the government policy should be altered to make admissible or more admissible such relatives than it does now, is of course, a matter that I could not decide.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But you are in a position to give it priority and to do everything possible to help that feature of the immigration work and the rules that will be laid down for your guidance.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Under those rules as now laid down, we do admit every relative that is admissible; there is not any question of trying to keep anyone out.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: The question is to change the rule and order in council.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I venture to say that nobody's advice will go farther than yours.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think some consideration should be given to the husbands and finances of the Canadian women. We have a case of a man who is married to an Ottawa girl. He unfortunately did his war service in the United States, for reasons, I presume, that he was not allowed to do it in Canada. He now cannot acquire his Canadian citizenship until another three years. His wife made a point the other day: she said: any Canadian man can bring in a wife. Yet she is a Canadian citizen so why is her husband excluded?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We discussed that question very fully; it is too bad that you were not here. Mr. Jolliffe gave us some real information in connection with that. As I understand it, a girl who lives in Canada who is legally a resident here does not lose her right to return by her marriage, even to an alien, and that the departmental policy is to make an exception for the husband of those girls, if that is within their power; I mean, if a man's health is all right and his character is good, and that sort of thing. They do it in each individual case on its own merits.

Dr. KEELEYSIDE: They recommend to the government that the rule be abandoned in the case concerned, and we prepare a draft order in council and send it up and then it is up to the government to decide whether to do it. They always do.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I have seen in the English papers where the wife of a United Kingdom citizen at once acquires a status, whereas the English girl married to an alien would not, which is rather curious.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Are you familiar with the regulations in Australia and New Zealand?

The CHAIRMAN: I know something about them in general.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I wonder if they had similar restrictions, which prohibit anyone from entering this country unless he was going to a specific job.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: I think I know the answer to that, but I am afraid that I am not sure enough to put it on the record.

At this point the discussion continued off the record.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are we all through now? We shall meet to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, to-morrow we shall meet again at 10.30 when we will have before us a representative of Mr. McNamara's office and we will also have Dr. MacKay who has recently been in Germany, and who has, I think, some valuable information to give up. Now, we are very much obliged to you, Dr. Keenleyside and we wish you would look with sympathetic consideration on every question involving immigration into this country, of valuable and much needed citizens.

Dr. KEENLEYSIDE: Thank you very much, sir. I am sure that sympathetic consideration will be given to every case that comes up.

The CHAIRMAN: The meeting now stands adjourned until 10.30 a.m. to-morrow, Thursday, April 24.

The Committee adjourned at 12.20 a.m. to meet again to-morrow, Thursday, April 24 at 10.30 a.m.



## APPENDIX A

P.C. 695

The 21st day of March, 1931.

(As amended by P.C. 885 dated the 23rd day of April, 1937,  
P.C. 5024 dated the 30th day of June, 1944,  
P.C. 2071 dated the 28th day of May, 1946, and  
P.C. 371 dated the 30th day of January, 1947).

From and after the 18th March, 1931, and until otherwise ordered the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, is prohibited, except as hereinafter provided:—

The Immigration Officer-in-Charge may permit to land in Canada any immigrant who otherwise complies with the provisions of the Immigration Act, if it is shown to his satisfaction that such immigrant is:—

1. A British subject entering Canada directly or indirectly from Great Britain or Northern Ireland, the Irish Free State, Newfoundland, the United States of America, New Zealand, Australia, or the Union of South Africa, who has sufficient means to maintain himself until employment is secured; Provided that the only persons admissible under the authority of this clause are British subjects by reason of birth or naturalization in Canada, Great Britain or Northern Ireland, the Irish Free State, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Australia, or the Union of South Africa.

2. A United States citizen entering Canada from the United States who has sufficient means to maintain himself until employment is secured.

3. The wife, unmarried son, daughter, brother or sister, the father or mother, the widowed daughter or sister with or without unmarried children under eighteen years of age, the orphan nephew or niece under 18 years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

4. (a) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.

(b) An agriculturist entering Canada to farm, when destined to a father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation who is in a position to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.

(c) A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.

(d) A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

5. The finnee of any adult male legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive, marry and care for his intended wife.



6. A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian Armed Forces and, having served in such Forces, has been honourably discharged therefrom.

And provided further that immigrants, as defined in paragraphs 2 and 4 above are destined for settlement to a province which has not signified its disapproval of such immigration.

The provisions of this Order in Council shall not apply to immigrants of any Asiatic race.

## APPENDIX B

P.C. 2071

PRIVY COUNCIL  
CANADA

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

TUESDAY, the 28th day of MAY, 1946.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

WHEREAS it is desirable to permit a somewhat increased movement of immigrants to Canada and at the same time provide for the admission of a number of refugees or displaced persons;

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, is pleased to amend Order in Council P.C. 695 of the 21st day of March, 1931, as amended by P.C. 885 of the 23rd day of April, 1937, and P.C. 5024, of the 30th day of June, 1944, prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, with certain exceptions, and it is hereby further amended by adding after paragraph 3 the following:

- (a) The father or mother, the unmarried son or daughter eighteen years of age or over, the unmarried brother or sister, the orphan nephew or niece under sixteen years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

(Sgd.) A. D. P. HEENEY,  
*Clerk of the Privy Council.*

The Honourable  
The Minister of Mines and Resources

## APPENDIX C

P.C. 371

PRIVY COUNCIL  
CANADA

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA

THURSDAY, the 30th day of JANUARY, 1947.

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources, is pleased to amend Order in Council P.C. 695 dated the 21st day of March, 1931 (as amended by Orders in Council P.C. 885, P.C. 5024 and P.C. 2071 dated the 23rd day of April, 1937, the 30th day of June, 1944, and the 28th day of May, 1946, respectively) prohibiting the landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations, with certain exceptions, and it is hereby further amended as follows:—

1. Paragraphs 3 and 3 "a" are rescinded and the following substituted therefor:

3. The wife, unmarried son, daughter, brother or sister, the father or mother, the widowed daughter or sister with or without unmarried children under eighteen years of age, the orphan nephew or niece under 18 years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

2. Paragraph 4 is rescinded and the following substituted therefor:

4. (a) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.

(b) An agriculturist entering Canada to farm, when destined to a father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation who is in a position to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.

(c) A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.

(d) A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

(Sgd.) A. D. P. HEENEY,  
*Clerk of the Privy Council.*

Gov. Doc  
Can  
Comm  
I

Canada Immigration and Labour  
Standing Committee, 1947

(1947)

(THE SENATE OF CANADA)



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 3

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

WITNESSES:

- Dr. Allon Peebles, Director, Research and Statistics Branch, Department of Labour.
- Mr. James Colley, Canadian Resident Representative, Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees.
- Reverend Ian MacKay, former U.N.R.R.A. worker in Germany.

APPENDIX

A. Table of Occupational Classification of D. P. Skills.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947







## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, 24th April, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators Murdock, Chairman; Bouchard, Buchanan, Burchill, Campbell, Crerar, Daigle, Donnelly, Euler, Ferland, Haig, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor, Veniot and Wilson—19.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Dr. Allon Peebles, Director, Research and Statistics Branch, Department of Labour, was heard, and read a brief on employment conditions in Canada, and was questioned by members of the Committee.

Mr. James Colley, Canadian Resident Representative, Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, was heard with respect to resettlement of refugees and displaced persons of Europe.

Reverend Ian MacKay, former U.N.R.R.A. worker in Germany, was heard with respect to the problem of displaced persons of Europe, and was questioned by members of the Committee.

At 12.35 p.m., the Committee adjourned to the rising of the Senate this day.

At 4.30 p.m., the Committee resumed.

Reverend Ian MacKay, former U.N.R.R.A. worker in Germany, was again heard.

Mr. James Colley, Canadian Resident Representative, Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, was again heard.

Reverend Ian MacKay filed a Table of Occupational Classification of D. P. Skills, which was ordered to be printed in the record.

On motion of the Honourable Senator Burchill, it was—

Ordered that the Honourable Senators Haig, Murdock and Roebuck, be appointed a Sub-Committee to arrange an appointment with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Mines and Resources and leaders of all other parties in the House of Commons to hear Reverend Ian MacKay, former U.N.R.R.A. worker in Germany, on the question of refugees and displaced persons of Europe, with the view that Canada admit a number of these displaced persons without delay.

At 6.00 p.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday, 30th April, instant, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

OTTAWA, Thursday, April 24, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, resumed this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK was in the Chair. \*

The committee got underway at 10.40 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, we had asked Mr. McNamara of the Department of Labour to be present to-day, but he was unable to come on account of illness; so we have with us Dr. Allon Peebles, Director of Research and Statistics, Department of Labour, who will present to us the views of the Labour Department.

Dr. Allon Peebles, Director of Research and Statistics, Department of Labour called:

Dr. PEEBLES: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators:—

## LABOUR SHORTAGES IN RELATION TO IMMIGRATION

In outline, this brief is in three parts, as follows:

- (1) comments on the general manpower situation;
- (2) an outline of the assumptions to be made in discussing shortages of labour in particular fields in relation to immigration;
- (3) discussion of the main labour-shortage fields.

### PART I—GENERAL MANPOWER PICTURE

For many months, Canadians have been enjoying all the advantages of a high level of employment and income. In fact, with the single exception of a few months late in 1945 and early in 1946, unemployment in Canada has been at a minimum for the last five years, at least. Even during the brief wave of unemployment about a year ago, very few qualified workers were not able to find jobs after a month or so.

The outlook for 1947 suggests a continuation of these "good times". This may even be a year of greater labour shortage than was most of 1946. Last year, the construction industry built about sixty thousand homes. This year, it is planning to build eighty thousand. Last year, investment in physical durable assets by the non-governmental sector of the economy reached about \$1,100 millions; this year, business enterprises forecast that investment will reach approximately \$1,700 millions. Last year, the problems of physical reconversion tended to hinder full-scale operations in many firms. This year, physical reconversion is complete.

During 1946, total civilian employment in Canada reached its highest peacetime level. At the same time, unemployment never exceeded 5 per cent of the labour force and was considerably lower during most of the year. Even now, at a time when there is a seasonal lull in employment, only 3 per cent of our

civilian labour force is out of work. It is safe to say that this is unemployment arising out of seasonality, occupational and location immobility, or out of the lapse of time between a worker leaving one job and finding another. It is quite consistent, therefore, with a full employment situation.

That is the end of Part I, dealing with the general manpower picture. Going on now to Part II:

## PART II—ASSUMPTIONS

These facts are of serious importance in weighing the significance of present labour shortages. These shortages have arisen against a background of generally high employment. If the present prosperity should be succeeded by depression, many labour shortages would be turned into labour surpluses. The following estimates of shortages in particular fields are based, therefore, upon the assumption of a continuance of high employment.

There is another fact to be considered when discussing specific labour shortages. There are cases in which shortages in some industries and some localities exist simultaneously with surpluses in other industries and localities. There are at present, for instance, many unskilled male labourers out of work in the Maritimes while in Ontario a very definite shortage exists for this type of worker. This condition is partly a result of the maldistribution of labour arising from the transition from war to peace. People who have worked during the war years in a certain industry in a certain province are unwilling to move quickly to another industry or another province, although their prospects of employment might thereby be improved. But, this situation to some extent corrects itself with the passage of time. Labour becomes more mobile, the longer the period taken into consideration. Some of these adjustments have already occurred. The estimates in the following discussion make allowance for additional adjustments of this kind which may occur in the next year or so.

There is a final consideration. An examination of the current labour shortage fields shows that many are characterized by relatively low wages or unfavourable working conditions. In other words, as long as other jobs are available, people will hesitate to accept these jobs. As a result, the rates of pay in these labour-shortage fields are being slowly increased to levels in line with those in other fields of endeavour.

In many cases, low wages or poor working conditions have been almost permanent characteristics of these jobs. In the case of domestic servants, for instance, wages during the Thirties averaged about \$15 a month with board and accommodation. The shortage of domestics over the last few years has raised their wages to about \$50 a month with board and accommodation. In other instances, the recent years of labour shortage have tended to cause considerable improvement in working conditions.

All of these points dictate caution in making estimates of the actual manpower shortages in particular fields. In addition, there is another more practical reason for being conservative. Other things being equal, it is better to bring in too few people at first than too many. More immigrants can always be allowed to enter later on. It is not so easy, however, to offset the effects of bringing in too many people.

For these reasons, therefore, the following estimates of labour shortages are conservative. Other considerations, including humanitarian ones, may modify this conservative view. In any case, the following estimates do provide a point of departure from which the present labour scarcity situation can be viewed in relation to immigration.

The following analysis is based on all the information which it has been possible to assemble. In most cases, a starting point has been provided by the data on unfilled vacancies and unplaced applicants as reported by the National Employment Service. These data, however, have certain qualifications.

In the first place, employers do not report as vacancies all the jobs they would actually like to fill, and some small employers may not report their vacancies at all. Other employers may be pessimistic regarding the possibility of obtaining their full requirements through the Employment Service. It follows from this qualification that there may be occupations in which a labour shortage exists and in which nevertheless the number of unfilled vacancies reported is somewhat less than the number of unplaced applicants.

Secondly, a proportion of the unplaced applicants reported for a given occupation may not actually possess the qualifications demanded by employers. There may be reported in such a case, therefore, a large number of unplaced applicants and also a large number of unfilled vacancies. As many of the applicants are not suitable for the corresponding vacancies, however, the figures would not give a true picture of the abundance or scarcity of labour in that occupation.

These are two main qualifications of the data. Neither of them, however, prevents us from concluding that, when the number of unfilled vacancies exceeds the number of unplaced applicants, a definite labour shortage exists in the occupation concerned. Their importance varies from occupation to occupation, and for that reason they will be mentioned in each specific discussion. The remainder of this brief is a discussion of labour shortages in specific fields. The estimates given cover the next one to two years.

### Part III: SPECIFIC FIELDS OF LABOUR SHORTAGE

#### *Agriculture*

There appears at first sight to be the prospect of a considerable shortage of agricultural labour in Canada in 1947. Adequate harvest labour was provided only with difficulty during the war years. Production targets have been raised above 1946 production for such important commodities as hogs, milk and milk products, eggs, coarse grains and other fodder, flaxseed, and sugar beets, while the only large decrease anticipated is in wheat acreage.

However, the greater part of the agricultural labour shortage is seasonal, occurring only at harvest time. This does not appear to be a shortage that could suitably be met by immigration. • It has been met in the past by organized movement of labour to the harvest areas, and should be so met in the future.

The present estimate also excludes farm operators brought to Canada to be placed on farms of their own. This question involves a survey of the supply of unoccupied land suitable for settlement, and is a long-run proposition.

The present estimate is therefore concerned only with agricultural labourers to be admitted to Canada for year-round employment.

The figures of Unfilled Vacancies and Unplaced Applicants furnished by the National Employment Service are of relatively little value in the case of farm labourers, due to the small proportion of farm labour placed through this channel. These figures, however, do show a considerable seasonal variation in the demand for labour, and a considerably greater shortage of farm labour in Ontario than in other parts of the country.

The relatively large number of vacancies in October, 1946, was due partly to requests for Polish veterans.



Estimates of the dormant demand for agricultural labourers, not registered as Unfilled Vacancies, were obtained from the Regional Offices of the National Employment Service as follows:

Maritimes—No immigrants required.

Quebec—500 (provided they can speak the local language).

Ontario—4,000 to 6,000.

Prairies—700.

British Columbia—300.

However, consideration of the response to the offer of Polish veterans as farm hands suggests a more modest estimate of the demand for year-round agricultural labour. The Poles brought to Canada in the autumn of 1946, numbering 2,876, were all placed, but there was no large unsatisfied demand for their services. In the near future, 1,124 more Poles are to be brought, and all are already placed, with an additional unsatisfied demand of about 600.

The demand for Polish veterans might be considered a fair indication of the demand for immigrant farm labour in general, little of which would be English or French-speaking. One would conclude that there is a demand for immigrants as year-round farm labour, but not a large one. The figure might be about 2,000 per year, assuming the continuance of a high level of employment in general.

This estimate is in addition to the Poles already brought or to be brought. From it should be subtracted any immigration of agricultural labourers under other arrangements, such as the bringing of relatives from Europe by people already in Canada.

In support of this modest estimate, it may also be pointed out that more than half of the labour now employed on Canadian farms (excluding farm operators) is unpaid, according to the D.B.S. Labour Force Survey. This unpaid labour no doubt consists chiefly of young people working for their families, and therefore not in the labour market. However, its presence suggests a relatively limited demand for paid agricultural labour, except on a seasonal basis.

Regarding sugar beet production, the Regional Employment Office at Winnipeg says:

Employment in the sugar beet industry in Manitoba and Alberta is available only on a contract basis which ties the worker to the job for about 6½-7 weeks in the summer and 4-4½ weeks in the fall. The average time actually worked is somewhere near 65 days in a year. The worker is under a necessity to take other employment for about two months during each summer and 7-7½ months each winter and spring. Under these conditions we (and this is the Winnipeg Regional office) do not favour supplying immigrant labour for this industry.

### *Logging*

The large totals of Unfilled Vacancies reported in logging correctly indicate a shortage of this type of labour, but greatly exaggerate the extent of the shortage. Due to the heavy labour turnover in logging (13 per cent per week at the height of the season) the total of vacancies reported by employers allows for a high percentage of replacements.

The following information comes from the Woods Labour Committee of the Pulp and Paper Industry:

Although employment in logging in the 1946-47 season was at an all-time peak, and an increase in production of pulp and paper of approximately 5 per cent is forecast for the coming year, there is no particular demand for immigrant labour for logging in most parts of the country. This is due chiefly to the poor results usually obtained from inexperienced labour. It was estimated that in

1946-47 the best 25 per cent of the loggers employed produced 50 per cent of the output, while the worst 25 per cent produced only 5 per cent of the output. There is a desire therefore to increase output by getting men into the bush earlier in the autumn, when the weather is favourable, rather than by employing more men at the peak of the season.

There is however a definite demand for immigrant labour from one particular region, the Lakehead area in Northwestern Ontario where three new pulp mills have been opened in this area. As the labour supply is small, labour for logging must be brought in from other areas. Transportation of labour is said to have cost the companies \$400,000 in the last year. These companies estimate that they could guarantee employment to from 6,000 to 8,000 immigrants, ten months in the year, for two years. Due to lack of housing, the men would have to be unmarried. Experienced labour is not expected, provided the individuals are rugged. Union wage rates would be paid, at the following rates per day:

Apprentices: \$4.65 less \$1.20 board.

Skilled men: \$6.20 less \$1.20 board.

Some demand for immigrant loggers is also anticipated in the Ottawa valley region of Ontario. Labour here is not unionized and wage rates would be lower.

This might raise the total estimate for Ontario to from 8,000-10,000.

Immigration into Ontario would reduce the demand for loggers from Quebec to a point at which there would probably be no demand for immigration of loggers into Quebec.

The Maritimes have sufficient surplus labour to supply their own needs.

Since the above total estimate of 8,000 to 10,000 men comes from employers, and probably allows for some decrease in the seasonal employment of Canadian labour, it seems best to give a conservative estimate of 5,000 to 6,000 single, unskilled men as the total of immigrants who could be absorbed in logging.

### *Mining*

In the mining industry, the picture across Canada is again one of labour shortage. At present, the strike in the coal mining industry in the Maritimes makes this region a temporary exception. Over the whole year before this strike, however, there had been a shortage of certificated coal miners in the Eastern provinces.

If the Maritime provinces are excluded, there are at present over 800 jobs in mining firms on hand at Employment Service offices. To meet this demand, there are 470 workers registered for this type of work. Many of these are unsuitable; about 125, or 27 per cent, for instance, are over 45 years of age.

Young workers are not turning to mining as a vocation. In a great many cases, the miners of to-day are decidedly against their children entering that occupation. Even in 1941, 54 per cent of all the miners in Canada were over 35 years of age. Since that time, this proportion has undoubtedly increased.

There were about 56,000 miners in Canada in 1941. During the war years, many of the young men in this industry were drawn into the armed forces and some left for other types of work. Employment in mining, therefore, dropped and only now is it approaching its pre-war level. The future heralds expansion if the workers can be found.

Mining is hard, dirty, dangerous work. Jobs, however, are relatively free from seasonality and wages are comparatively high. In Quebec, experienced hardrock miners are receiving about 85 cents an hour for a 48-hour week with board provided at \$1.40 a day. Rates are higher in Ontario and British Columbia. If native Canadians refuse to become miners in larger numbers, the immigration of skilled miners seems a logical solution.

At present, many employers are not listing their openings for miners with the Employment Service because they believe that the existing shortage precludes the possibility of any referrals being made. For this reason, the actual scarcity of workers in this industry is greater than that suggested by the figures quoted above.

It is difficult, however, to estimate the exact number of workers that could be absorbed by the mining industry if they were available. The chairman of the Canadian Congress of Mining recently said that the mining industry could use 50,000 to 100,000 immigrants. This is obviously far too optimistic.

Even if high employment continues, however, the future of the Canadian mining industry is not at all clear. No recent discoveries of large coal fields in Canada, which could be economically mined, have been made. The Maritime fields have been greatly depleted. Mr. N. F. Parkinson, Manager of the Ontario Mining Association, has recently said that, unless the price of gold is increased, the gold mining industry will be in a difficult position. This is not likely unless the Canadian dollar is devaluated. In fact, the current price of gold is only maintained because the United States is willing to pay that much. The major markets for base metals are foreign countries, and the ability of many of them to buy is only being upheld by Canadian foreign credits.

It seems likely, however, that about 300-400 experienced coal miners and 2,000 hardrock miners could be absorbed at current wages if agreements were made with the unions concerned. These figures would include the shortage indicated above in N.E.S. figures. Since housing would have to be provided in the form of bunkhouses, these workers would need to be single men. It should be added that any positive action by the government to stimulate the hardrock mining industry would raise the above estimates considerably.

Finally, the employment of this many additional experienced miners would open at least an equivalent number of jobs for unskilled mine labourers. The labour situation for workers of this type is discussed elsewhere in this report.

### *Construction*

A shortage of most types of construction labour is indicated by the figures of Unfilled Vacancies and Unplaced Applicants. Due to the high seasonality of the industry, it is difficult to estimate the deficit or surplus in any one occupation. The totals of Unfilled Vacancies and Unplaced Applicants for October 3, 1946, during the active season, show deficits of approximately 800 bricklayers, 1,100 carpenters, 70 cement finishers, 160 plasterers, and 2,700 unskilled labourers. At the same time there were surpluses of approximately 600 painters and 400 plumbers. At March 27, 1947, during the slack season, all the deficits had been replaced by surpluses, except in bricklayers and plasterers, the shortage of which therefore appears to be most acute.

Estimates of dormant demand, in addition to vacancies reported, were received from the Regional Offices. These amounted to 150 bricklayers, and stonemasons for the Maritimes, 160 of the same trades for the Prairies, and 50 for British Columbia. No precise figures were given for Quebec or Ontario.

The demand for construction appears certain to be still greater in 1947 than in 1946, assuming the continuance of business activity at a high level. The target of the housing program is 80,000 dwelling units for the year. The Department of Reconstruction has estimated an increase of 53 per cent in investment in industrial plant and equipment, if all plans can be carried out. This includes an increase of 17.3 per cent in construction, from the estimated actual total of \$492 million in 1946 to the forecast total of \$577 million for 1947.

On the basis of the preceding data, it would seem that approximately 500 bricklayers and 100 plasterers, at a conservative estimate, could be absorbed immediately in Canada, if qualified immigrants could be obtained. But in view of the needs of Europe, it seems unlikely that they would be available.



*Male Heavy Labourers*

The fact that Canadian workers are shunning jobs where wages are relatively low or where working conditions are relatively poor has also created a shortage of husky workers willing and able to perform heavy labouring tasks. During the war years, the shortage of this type of worker was very acute, at times amounting to 50,000 men. In the brief interval when reconversion had slowed industrial activity considerably, there was a temporary surplus of these workers. Over the last year, the picture has again been one of labour scarcity.

A shortage situation is not indicated by a cursory glance at the records of the Employment Service. At present, for instance, there are 11,000 jobs on file while about 54,000 applicants are registered as seeking this type of work. An analysis of these figures, however, will give some indication of the true picture in this field.

It is probable that in no other field is the reporting of vacancies by employers so incomplete as it is in respect to male unskilled labour. "Block" hiring at the "gate" is the most common method of recruiting this type of worker.

On the other hand, in the case of the applicants registered with the Employment Service, a large proportion are unsuitable. Of the 54,000 currently registered, about 35 per cent are 45 years of age and over. Many others do not measure up to the physical requirements of the jobs which need to be done. And many others are almost unemployable in the sense that they cannot be relied upon.

Our mines, our foundries, our packing plants, and our other heavy manufacturing plants need young, husky workers who will stick with their jobs. This is again a case where immigration might meet a need.

How many men could be placed in this type of work? Taking into consideration the expansion of Canadian industry during the war, as well as the great shortage of this type of worker which existed during the war years, a conservative estimate is that about 5,000 physically fit young men who are willing to work could be placed as heavy labourers. This is in addition to estimates of miners, construction workers, etc. made in other sections of this report.

*Women in Service Work (domestic servants and waitresses)*

Under this heading are included domestic servants, waitresses, kitchen workers, as well as all kinds of skilled and unskilled help for hospitals, hotels, restaurants and laundries. Female domestic servants obviously form the largest single group.

Since most of the work in this whole field makes use of experience which is gained by the housewife in the performance of her everyday duties, almost all of the workers are women.

There are labour shortages in all of these individual occupations.

The two largest groups, domestic servants and waitresses, will be discussed in some detail, however, before the service group as a whole is dealt with.

We are all familiar with the widespread shortage of domestic servants in Canada. Even during the war, but more particularly since its end, there have been many more jobs in this type of work registered at the offices of the National Employment Service than there were applicants. Over the past year, this excess of jobs above applicants has been continually around 3,000.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: How does he get at that figure of 3,000?

Dr. PEEBLES: That figure is based on the records from the individual offices of the National Employment Service. They report every week by occupation the number of jobs open, and the number of workers there are available to fill those jobs, or who have asked for jobs of this kind.



Hon. Mr. HAIG: Allow me to suggest that, for example in the city which I know most about, I think there is about one in one hundred of the people who would like to have domestic help who ever apply.

Dr. PEEBLES: I would agree with the honourable senator that there is a far greater demand than is shown by these actual figures of 3,000; but we do endeavour to find out from the Regional Offices what the additional demand which has not been registered with them, would amount to. I am certain it would be a larger figure, much larger.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: There is a feeling that domestic help, that is, that the demand for domestic help is available but that they do not make application to the offices.

Dr. PEEBLES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And the type that is sent to fill the position is so disastrous that people are afraid to apply again at all. I can give you some very pertinent instances and of its effect. So that I think your estimate would really be only about one to one hundred.

Dr. PEEBLES: I am very glad that you brought up that point.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I quite acknowledge that my experience in life has taught me that the domestic servant was given rotten treatment right through the piece, and if we hope to fill those positions we have to reorganize that whole thing and to make a domestic person feel that he is a person and not a slave. Thank you.

Dr. PEEBLES: In order to meet this shortage, especially with respect to light household work, the Department of Labour, through its National Employment Service, inaugurated a Home Aide service some time ago. This plan was designed to bring together the prospective employer and the woman who would undertake the lighter housekeeping duties for short daily periods. From September, 1945 to December, 1946 over 7,600 placements have been made under this scheme. Despite this measure, however, an extensive shortage continues.

In 1941, there were about 150,000 female domestic servants in Canada. During the following years, when our manpower resources were mobilized towards the prosecution of a "total" war, thousands of women left domestic work in favour of war jobs and in order to replace men in other jobs in civilian industry. For much the same reasons, domestic service did not obtain its usual complement of younger workers over this period.

When the war ended, many women retired from the labour force. In addition, the war had given the woman worker an opportunity to demonstrate that she could do many jobs just as efficiently, if not more so, than a man. And finally, jobs in industry were more attractive to women because of their higher rates of pay.

The wages of the domestic servant have always been relatively low. During the 'thirties, the typical domestic servant received about \$15.00 a month with board and accommodation, and worked long hours with little personal freedom. At present, however, wages are considerably higher, about \$50.00 a month with board and accommodation, and working conditions are much better. Even these improvements, however, have not been sufficient to attract women from other fields of employment.

In many ways, the labour market situation for *waitresses* is parallel to that for domestic servants.

During the war, many women left this type of work in order to take industrial jobs. Since the war ended, they have not returned to jobs of this kind in nearly the same extent. The war-time shortage, therefore, continues.

Before the war, rates of pay for waitresses, like those for domestics, were relatively low. Even in 1941, the 22,000 waitresses in the country earned an average of only \$8.00 for each week that they were employed. On the whole, they were employed an average of only 36 weeks during that year.

The seasonality of this work is further confirmed by the number of jobs listed at the offices of the Employment Service. During the summer, the surplus of jobs for waitresses reaches 3,000, while in the late winter it drops to about 600.

The demand for waitresses is bound up with the level of business activity in hotels and restaurants. For this reason one should be conservative in evaluating the current shortage. There is little doubt but that there is an increasing tendency for the Canadian people to obtain their meals in restaurants. During the war, however, this trend was greatly speeded up due to the vast shifts which occurred in the gainful activities of the country's population and the resultant changes in their living habits. Since the war ended, this abnormal situation has persisted, primarily because of the general housing shortage. As homes become more plentiful, therefore, it may be that business activity among restaurants will recede slightly.

There is one general problem which pervades all kinds of service occupations, and that is the social stigma which people seem to attach to this type of work, and to domestic work in particular. This stigma and unsatisfactory working conditions account for the disinclination of Canadian girls to enter domestic service, a disinclination which foreign immigrants might not have to the same degree.

What is the extent of the current shortage of service workers in Canada? Many thousands of young, single girls could be placed in permanent work in this field at current wages. With all the above considerations in mind, and making allowance for the seasonality of some of the work, the number might be from 10,000 to 12,000.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Before you leave that, had Dr. Peebles been reading the papers, he would have noticed where a waitress in Winnipeg had just been left a large estate. I pass that on for an example of what a waitress can accomplish.

-Dr. PEEBLES: I suppose the waitresses in cities which are less favourably treated than Winnipeg would like to be included.

### *Women in Manufacturing*

A shortage of women, both skilled and unskilled, for manufacturing in Quebec and Ontario appears in the Unfilled Vacancies and Unplaced Applicants figures. In other parts of Canada, there is a small surplus of female labour.

According to these figures, at March 27, 1947, the shortage in Quebec and Ontario totalled approximately 5,500 skilled and 6,000 unskilled women. The greater part of the shortage in both was in secondary textiles. The shortage of sewing machine operators was about 4,000 (classed as skilled).

Other industries in which the demand is relatively large are food and tobacco; boots, shoes, and leather products; radio manufacturing; and laundering, cleaning, and pressing.

The possibility of filling positions with unemployed women is reduced by the fact that the majority of female applicants are married, and by lack of housing in the centres where jobs are available.

There is probably a large unreported demand for female labour to be added to the Unfilled Vacancies total. On the other hand, many of the vacancies reported are for low-wage jobs, which will not be filled as long as better opportunities are available.

Perhaps 5,000 to 6,000 female immigrants could be placed in industry in Ontario and Quebec without encouraging the payment of substandard wages. To fill lower wage jobs also, including dormant demand, an additional 5,000 to 10,000 female immigrants might be absorbed, making a total of from 10,000 to 16,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a summary of the figures arrived at in the previous part of this report.

*Summary—*

The fields of major labour shortage which might be provided for by immigration over the next one to two years are:

<i>Industry or Group</i>	<i>Estimated Shortage</i>	
	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
<i>Males</i>		
Agriculture .....	2,000	2,000
Logging .....	5,000	6,000
Mining .....	2,300	2,400
Construction .....	600	600
Unskilled Labour .....	5,000	5,000
Total .....	14,900	16,000
<i>Females</i>		
Women in service work .....	10,000	12,000
Women in manufacturing .....	10,000	16,000
Total .....	20,000	28,000
Grand Total .....	34,900	44,000

### A NOTE ON SPECIALIZED FIELDS

Many other more specialized fields exist, of course, which are also characterized by manpower shortages. At present, for instance, the demand for people with technical or administrative training far exceeds the supply.

With respect to technical personnel, however, it is possible that there are enough students in training in Canadian universities to eventually satisfy this dormant demand. This assumes, however, that the departure of technically-trained persons from Canada will be kept to a minimum. In this connection, one region reports that, as an example of the demand for technical persons, all of the seventy graduates in engineering from the University of Manitoba this Spring have been spoken for by industry. Minimum wages appear to be about \$2,400 per year with a considerable promise for rapid increases by at least 50 per cent within six months and 100 per cent within a year to eighteen months as the graduate acquires knowledge of the particular business in which he is placed. A similar situation exists in this university for those who are graduating in physics, geology, geophysics, and agriculture.

In the case of executive persons, there have been a few importation requests by firms establishing new branches in Canada. In these cases, it has been necessary to concur in the request because the persons concerned were fully conversant with the products and general policies of the parent company.

First-class garage mechanics is another type of worker who is in great demand. Employment in that trade, however, is controlled by collective agreement and competency certificates are also required. No direct importation of workers, therefore, could be absorbed.

There are other examples. Tip Top Tailors require 100 trained tailors and have made requests to import such workers. The Arvida plant of the Aluminum Company of Canada anticipate requirements for about 1,000 men; about 500 of these could be immigrants.



In conclusion, a word might be said about contract labour. Under the Contract Labour Law, admission to Canada has been asked for a total of 352 workers from January 1, 1947, to April 1, 1947. Of these requests, 55 were for executive and managerial workers and 18 for engineers. In addition, the requests for admission included 131 skilled and semi-skilled workers in various trades, no one predominating. The total of 352 included the 100 tailors asked for by Tip Top Tailors in Toronto.

That, Mr. Chairman, finishes the presentation. Now I would be glad to answer any questions that I can.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether Senator Buchanan wants to bring up the matter concerning the beet fields in connection with where it is indicated in this statement that there is work for only about two months a year.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I am familiar with the operation of the contract system; a family, that is, parents and children employed during the months from spring to fall would earn a considerable amount of money as a whole. They are provided with a home and most of the furnishings for it and a plot of ground where they can raise vegetables and they may also raise some chickens and some other live stock on that plot of ground; and I know from my experience, from the opening of this sugar beet industry, for instance, that a very large number of Hungarians came in to work in that sugar beet industry. They rented land and saved their money and now about 80 per cent of those Hungarians either own or operate the land themselves, or are leasing land. They must have been able to make some money. In the season from spring to fall they can make enough money to provide themselves for the whole year. Now, while we are on the subject of sugar beets, you were speaking about the Poles. The Poles are single men and they do not fit into this picture that I am speaking of. It would be the family type of labour not the contract. The Pole would be a single man and while he would be provided with some of the facilities, he would be working only for himself and not for a family, or rather would not have a family working for him, and I understand it would mean merely a temporary arrangement. Am I right?

Dr. PEEBLES: I understand that the commitment would have two years or about that, on the part of the Polish immigrant.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, we have got two other speakers here this morning. Are there any further questions that you wanted to ask of Dr. Peebles, or shall we proceed?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You spoke about waitresses particularly. In how many provinces have they got a Minimum Wage Law for that type of labour?

Dr. PEEBLES: I cannot tell you that, offhand, Senator.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: But it is fairly general, is it not?

Dr. PEEBLES: I would say so.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And they are organized in a good many provinces, as a union made up of workers or waitresses, and by which they have been able to get considerable increases in recent years.

Dr. PEEBLES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: In Manitoba it is mostly done under the Minimum Wage Law.

The CHAIRMAN: What is that?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not know the figures, but it is the most effective way and it is generally considered quite satisfactory. In fact, the troubles that occur are conditions rather than wages; I mean, the surroundings in which they work, the sleeping accommodations and the off-hours and that kind of thing. These are the objections, but the wage itself is not a strenuous issue.



The CHAIRMAN: Now, are there any other questions?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I would like to ask Dr. Peebles if this brief represents the views of the Labour Department in regard to this question?

Dr. PEEBLES: The brief has not been seen by Mr. McNamara because he has been out of town, so I cannot speak for him, personally; but the brief has been gone over by the acting deputy minister, who is in agreement with it.

The CHAIRMAN: And who is he?

Dr. PEEBLES: Mr. Arthur H. Brown.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Then, in your view, generally, the policy in regard to immigration should be based on the number of jobs that are available.

Dr. PEEBLES: No, I would not say that, Senator Crerar. What we were asked to do was simply to present the picture in so far as labour shortage existed, actually, or what we thought was potential, and to relate that to immigration. There was one sentence in the brief that mentioned humanitarian considerations. We did not try to do a complete job covering the various phases of immigration, but merely with respect to the labour shortages, and that aspect of it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Because there are two approaches, I think, to this question. The first approach, which is currently held and has been held over several years: that we should not seek to bring this country more people than could be placed in jobs. And the other view, which frankly I share, is that it is not an important consideration. I do not think there is an argument that can be made in support of the first view today that could not have been made with greater force fifty years ago, when immigration really started coming into this country, because I am old enough to recall the conditions of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Go carefully now, go carefully; age is a bad problem.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Now, the second view obtained in the shaping of government policy between, I would say, 1890 and 1895, over the next twenty or twenty-five years when immigration to Canada was at the highest point it has ever been, running into several hundred thousand a year, I would think, on an average, offhand. Now, these people came here; they did not have jobs in sight, but they were willing to work and they soon became very definite factors in production in this country. I am thinking particularly about one group, the Ukrainians, who started to come here before the end of the last century. They brought no capital, but they went into districts and made farms for themselves. To-day our high unit in production are those very farms and from their descendants have come members of the professions, school teachers and people in business all over the country. Now, my point is this, Dr. Peebles, that if we had, fifty years ago, adopted what I think is the current attitude towards immigration to-day, namely, that only jobs that are available, that is, that immigration should be limited, roughly to jobs that are available, which I rather got the impression was the view that you expressed in your statement—

The CHAIRMAN: Might I interject a word. Possibly I am responsible for the form that this brief has taken. I said, when inviting Mr. McNamara to the committee, that the committee had proposed that he be asked to come to give us his views on the labour scarcity situation.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes, but I am not finding any fault with the brief which Dr. Peebles has presented. I think he has presented it very admirably and in accordance with your request; but I am referring to what might be termed as general policy and I repeat: that if that view had been held fifty years ago, this country would not have developed in any way like the way it has developed. It would have been wholly unable to play the part in the first and second great wars that it did play and we would be lagging away behind where we are to-day.

So it seems to me that if we limit, if we shape or frame our policy to-day on the basis of present needs, that we will be falling short, because I am one of those who believe that the same opportunities exist to-day in Canada for development that existed fifty years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: In short, take a chance and aim high.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: On the matter of procedure, Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly what Senator Crerar has said needed to be said at the close of this brief so that nobody will understand that the Labour Department is coming here with such an argument; they have done what we asked them to do and they have given us useful information and a very thoughtful and admirable brief which is full of information; but I would point out to the committee that we have two other speakers here to-day and also that we have to adjourn to-day at 12.30 because of a luncheon, so we must bear that in mind. I would like to ask a lot of questions arising out of this brief, but I simply cannot do it.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, after the brief has been analysed by us, it may be that we might want the witness to return.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: So, good-bye for the present, Dr. Peebles.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Senator Crerar suggests that we do that, so let us make an arrangement later on; let us go on with his brief realizing that all that Dr. Peebles has done now is tell us of the jobs that are available in accordance with the records of their department, estimated to the best of their ability in that department.

The CHAIRMAN: In other words, as set out in the brief.

Dr. PEEBLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Peebles at this point retired.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I would suggest that we call on Mr. Colley now. He is the local representative of the International Committee for Refugees. Have I phrased it correctly?

Mr. COLLEY: No, I am not the representative in Canada of the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes. Mr. Colley holds an official position and is looking at it from the inside out, while Dr. MacKay looks at it from the outside in. Therefore it seems reasonable that Mr. Colley should speak first.

### **James Colley, Canadian Representative, Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees, called:**

Mr. COLLEY: I am very glad to be here to-day. I have had experience in immigration over the last 35 years. I have had practical experience with the sugar beet workers.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I think you should first inform the committee that you were with the Canadian Pacific, Department of Colonization for a considerable time and also with the Lethbridge Irrigation District in its early days.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes; I have been with the Canadian Pacific Railway and I was assistant commissioner of the Department of Immigration and Colonization, until February 1st of this year. Then I went to Montreal in 1929 and was Superintendent of the department. Previous to that I was district superintendent at Calgary, and I had a lot to do with colonization and settlement in the province of Alberta. And I was for many years Secretary of the Western

Canada Irrigation Association, which was an association dealing with the development of the irrigated areas in southern Alberta and British Columbia. Then in 1921 I was secretary of the commission appointed by the Alberta government to survey the drought areas in southern Alberta; and following the report of that commission I was colonization manager for the Lethbridge Irrigation district for some years until a re-arrangement of the rates when I returned to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1925, and took a part in getting the sugar beet factory established in Raymond. One of the problems that we realized in connection with the settlement of irrigable land was the provision of a sugar beet factory so that the land could be used to its fullest economical value and so that it would afford us an opportunity to place settlers. On the other hand, we afforded the industry an opportunity to get their raw product. So, before the factory was erected, we interviewed the farms and the sugar companies and that finally resulted in our bringing and settling those Hungarians as colonists in that neighbourhood. The first men who were brought in were not what we wanted. We brought in Hungarian single men; whose families we brought out later. These men started in as labourers. Many of them owed the money for their transportation to somebody on the other side; but they have become the owners or lessees of land and are now the mainstay of that industry. I consider that the sugar beet proposition offers the best opportunity for settlement that exists in Canada at the present time; because if you take a family during the two or three months of the year in which that family is employed, they can earn sufficient to cover all their expenses and to enable them to purchase, first of all, equipment and then to make arrangements for renting land. That has been done in the past and it can be done in the future. On the other hand, single men would not be a success. It does not matter if you tie them down to a two-year contract, they will not be a success unless there is the possibility of bringing their families out to them later. But with a family, a man has his wife and a couple of children, say, and they earn quite a substantial sum.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And there is lots of land?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, and beyond that there are 300,000 acres of arable land, now under cultivation, that the provincial governments are putting millions of dollars into. They will need these settlers; and the best kind of settlers have been those who came in with nothing and have earned from production on the land. That is possible to be done again. Unfortunately, the labour officials have not understood that possibility or taken it into consideration. There is no doubt that if families are brought in there they can make good for the future development of this country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You apparently do not agree with our present immigration ban against married people?

Mr. COLLEY: I would not say there is, so far as I know, a ban against married people.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, yes there is.

Mr. COLLEY: Among the displaced persons we have families who, if they had been brought over in time for this year, would have been suitable and they would have been recruits or candidates for settlement, in two or three years time, when these 300,000 acres are ready for settlement. And beyond that, there are probably 500,000 acres more than that that can be brought under irrigation. I do not know of any land settlement opportunity in Canada equivalent to the irrigable land opportunities that I have mentioned and that has something to do with my present work, because this IGCR organization may be interested in promoting land settlement opportunities later on.

Hon. Mr. CRRERAR: You are speaking now of Alberta?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, mainly of Alberta.



Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And he has been expanding on what I said.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Your work now, Mr. Colley, is with the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, and if I may, I would like to read you some notes. They are not my own notes, but I will read them to you:

#### NOTES ON DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES AVAILABLE FOR EMIGRATION

1. The concern of the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees with the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons through migration dates from the inception of the Committee in 1938, when it was created to care for refugees from Germany and Austria.

*The following 35 countries are members of this Committee:* Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovak Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eire, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela.

In 1943 it was reorganized and its mandate was extended to include all persons who have had to leave, or may have to leave, their countries of residence because of threat to life or property arising out of their race, religion or political belief. During the war, help was given wherever this was possible to nationals of the United Nations as well as to stateless persons and refugees from Nazi persecution who came within the mandate. Subsequent to the end of hostilities, without any change being made in mandate and pending further clarification of the problem, the program of activities was, in practice, confined to the following classes:—

- (a) Austrian and German refugees from Nazi persecution.
- (b) Spanish refugees.
- (c) Some other stateless persons.

On July 16, 1946, at the instances of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the Executive Committee sanctioned an extension of the practical activities of the Committee within its mandate. The main objects of this extension are to facilitate the work of the new organization (the International Refugee Organization) which it is proposed to establish as a specialized agency related to the United Nations, first, by undertaking certain measures preliminary to resettlement, and second, by undertaking resettlement itself so far as this is practicable. These measures relate to all persons otherwise eligible who come within the mandate of the Committee, including displaced persons not otherwise disqualified who are unable, or definitely unwilling, to return to their countries of nationality or habitual residence. The Committee will observe the principles contained in the Draft Constitution for the International Refugee Organization.

2. Subject to these principles, the effect of the decision of the Executive Committee above mentioned is that the Committee has undertaken the responsibility for making every effort to find new homes for those refugees and displaced persons who are unwilling or unable to return to their own countries. Since the end of hostilities in Europe, approximately 6,000,000 displaced persons and refugees have been repatriated. Repatriation still continues, and every effort is being made by the Governments concerned and UNRRA to encourage as many persons as possible to return to their countries of nationality or former residence. It is estimated however, that there are to-day in various European countries



approximately 850,000 refugees and displaced persons. It is thought that a large proportion of this number are candidates for emigration overseas. The majority are in Germany, Austria and Italy, but there are also scattered groups in various countries of Europe and elsewhere.

These countries are members of the Executive Committee:"

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You have not told us of your present position and what it is.

Mr. COLLEY: I am Resident Representative of this Committee with which I am dealing.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is it?

Mr. COLLEY: The Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees. And this brief explains what we are doing; I mean, it explains what the Committee is and what are its functions.

3. Approximate figures of the composition by nationality of these 850,000 are as follows:

Poles .....	400,000	{Lithuanians ....	70,000
Balts .....	200,000	{Latvians .....	100,000
Yugoslavs .....	75,000	{Estonians .....	30,000
Others .....	175,000		
<hr/>			
850,000			

The figure for Poles, as also the gross total of 850,000 does not include those who are members of General Onders' Forces, in regard to whom the government of the United Kingdom has accepted primary responsibility.

With regard to religion, it is estimated about 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the total of 850,000 are Jews; the overwhelming majority of the remainder are Catholics, some of whom belong to the Orthodox Church, but the predominant number to the Roman Catholic Church. There are some Protestants, but they probably do not exceed 10 per cent of the total.

4. The sex and age composition of the principal groups among the displaced persons and refugees expressed in percentages is as follows:

Men .....	48 per cent	Children	
Women .....	34 per cent	under 16....	18 per cent

These averages are substantially accurate for the Polish and Baltic groups of refugees, but the percentage of men is 56 among the Jewish group and 61 in the Yugoslav, and there are only 7 per cent of children under 16 among the Jewish refugees and displaced persons.

5. Occupational professional skills are very widely represented among the refugees and displaced persons and appropriate selection would provide large numbers of skilled workers for any trade or profession. A very rough and partial analysis of occupations made by UNRRA in the displaced persons assembly centres in Germany shows that agriculture, forestry and dairy and food processing is the largest occupational category accounting for 45 per cent of the employable men and women in the Polish group, 26 per cent among the Yugoslavs and 16 per cent respectively in the Baltic and Jewish groups.

Other major occupational categories which are well represented are communications, supply and transportation, the metal trades, construction and maintenance trades, health and sanitation services, administrative clerical and commercial occupations and the professions and the arts. Personal service trades such as shoemakers, tailors, dressmakers, etc. account for perhaps 25 per cent of the employable persons among the refugees and displaced persons.

It will thus be seen that the field of selection is very wide, that there are roughly a quarter of a million practical agriculturists that may be available for emigration and settlement and that there is a large supply of skilled and semi-skilled labour suitable for various industries.

6. The methods of settlement which the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is pursuing are, apart from repatriation, first, the settlement by immigration of individuals and family units, and second, the resettlement of persons by groups on a larger scale. It is prepared to assist with the costs of transportation by individuals and family units, and is anxious to enter into negotiation with potential Governments of reception regarding resettlement of the larger groups. It welcomes the opportunity of sending representatives to countries of reception for the purpose of discussing the requirements of such countries and the best practical means of meeting them, and it has found from experience that preliminary discussions of this kind are the most satisfactory method of ascertaining the exact types and classes of emigrants and settlers who will best promote the interests of their countries of adoption."

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: As a result of this organization, has there been a movement of refugees into these countries which are members?

Mr. COLLEY: Oh, there has been some, to Brazil, to Paraguay, and to some of the other South American countries.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know how many?

Mr. COLLEY: Offhand I would say perhaps 5,000 altogether.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you got ships?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes; this organization got ships to send them over to Brazil.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And could you get ships to bring them here?

Mr. COLLEY: We have had an opportunity, on two or three different occasions, that would have brought people here, had we been able to bring people over in bulk; but we have not had the authority to bring people over in bulk. We would have to go over them and sort them out and in order to do that it takes time and then we find that the shipping is not available; but if we had authority to take them in bulk, we could have had a shipload over here in March.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And what would you have done with them after you got them here?

Mr. COLLEY: The organizations here would have taken care of that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is your organization an established and working organization?

Mr. COLLEY: Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I notice that you say here: "International Refugee Organization which it is proposed to establish as a specialized agency relating to the United Nations."

Mr. COLLEY: Intergovernmental Committee was formed in 1938; it is performing those functions preparatory to the IRO which will function in relation to immigration and resettlement when it is formed. UNRRA has not been responsible for immigration and resettlement.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you in the meantime, an established organization?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, the Canadian government helps to support this organization; the United Kingdom and the United States are probably the largest supporters.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know how much we have appropriated for the expenses of this committee?

Mr. COLLEY: I have not the figures at the moment.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And who is the head of it?

Mr. COLLEY: Sir Herbert Emerson; he is the Director-General.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Britain is taking 15,000 Balts.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, Britain is taking 15,000 Balts and they are ready to take a regular number every month, a set number monthly.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The first group of them arrived the other day. Matthew Halton spoke about it a couple of nights ago.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Do you co-operate with the Department of Immigration here?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, we do; our department has the master list and receives it from them; which contains the applications from close relatives; and as the people on this list are approved, I notify them and I pass it on to overseas where they set to work and sort these people out and get ready to ship them. We brought over 50 on the Aquitania on the first of this month, and there will be another 50 on the 28th.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How do you work with our Immigration Committee over here? Do you bring the proposed immigrants to the Immigration office?

Mr. COLLEY: The immigration team work with the IGCR in the camps over there.

The CHAIRMAN: But the Immigration Department says that an enemy alien does not come within the mandate of the IGCR.

Mr. COLLEY: These are displaced persons that I am talking about.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if they are Austrians, or German refugees?

Mr. COLLEY: Well, that is referring to the time when we were formed.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot quite understand the difference between your contention and the contention of the Immigration Department.

Mr. COLLEY: The Austrians and German refugees referred to here are mostly Jewish refugees who were in trouble before the war.

The CHAIRMAN: What about Spanish refugees?

Mr. COLLEY: This dates from before the war and it is what we were formed for originally; and this committee is still responsible for the Spanish refugees but has not tried to place them in Canada. I suppose their final hope is to get them back to the countries of their origin.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: But were not the Jewish refugees that you refer to from Austria and Germany?

Mr. COLLEY: The Jew, no matter to what country he belongs, is considered as a displaced person.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: How is that considered by your organization?

Mr. COLLEY: Well, as I have explained in the second paragraph, we are working on the mandate of the IRO which was drawn up at Lake Success last year.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: That does not say how you can say that a Jewish citizen of Hungary is not a Hungarian.

Mr. COLLEY: No, I do not suppose it does; but Jewish refugees or displaced persons are considered by this organization as people for whom we ought to have some concern.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Was that the feeling in 1938 before the war began?

Mr. COLLEY: The refugee was an international problem before the war began, and the United Kingdom and the United States and other governments thought they had to do something about it; so they formed this committee. It is not a private committee.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And the governments are financing this committee?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And the Dominion of Canada has contributed its share to this committee?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In a very considerable amount?

Mr. COLLEY: Considerable in a way, but in proportion to the others; I think it is about four per cent of the Funds. The object of establishing a representative in Canada was to deal with the present problem not with the past problem, but the problem of the displaced person and the refugee in camps in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why you use this language: "which it was proposed to establish as a specialized agency related to the United Nations."

Mr. COLLEY: Yes; we are carrying on under their mandate until such time as they are ready to carry on. This organization is meeting in Geneva at the present time to arrive at final arrangements for the establishment of the IRO which it is expected will be arrived at by the end of June. In the meantime the problem is one of resettlement or repatriation, and somebody had to carry on with it; so this committee is carrying on that particular work.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you located in Ottawa.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we may want to see you sometime again before we get through with this inquiry.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I take it from your remarks that you feel, yourself, that as the present policy is carried out, it is almost impossible for you to do anything to bring a large number of these displaced persons to Canada?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, to assemble a large number of people together and to make arrangements for chartering a ship, it is practically impossible.

The CHAIRMAN: Have the immigration regulations anything to do with it?

Mr. COLLEY: No; the immigration regulations at the present time permit people to come here.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: But I gathered that you did not think so because you said that the Immigration Department would give you a list and you would sort them out, but that there was no way under the present policy for you to get them to Canada.

Mr. COLLEY: This latest order in council permits the bringing forward of people who are assured of employment. If this committee were authorized to select people on the other side without reference to any relative on this side or without reference to a particular job, we could do that, but we have not had an authorization to do so. I think the order in council would not permit that, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we are very much obliged and we may want to hear from you later.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Is the witness of the opinion that his organization should bring a man from Austria, from Hungary or from Germany say who is not a Jew.

Mr. COLLEY: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Well, the order in council here says not.

Mr. COLLEY: Not if he is a Hungarian. I do not want to be misunderstood about this. I do not think we could bring anybody from Austria or Hungary.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Or from Germany?

Mr. COLLEY: Or from Germany, who is not a displaced person.



Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: But there are more people who are displaced who are not Jews, in those countries; there are people who are displaced persons who are not Jews in those countries to-day; can you bring any of those people here? Can your organization do so?

Mr. COLLEY: We are limited by the mandate set out by the United Nations and we are also limited by the Canadian laws as to what is an enemy alien. The Jews that we would bring over would be, practically, called stateless persons.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I think the question is: they are not Jews; they are displaced persons, although Austrians and Hungarians; would they be allowed to come over?

Mr. COLLEY: No, an Austrian or a Hungarian or anybody; it is a long story; any enemy alien or one who is assumed to have assisted them is precluded. I could read to you what the IRO says in its mandate about this thing. This was drawn up in a discussion at Lake Success and there were all sorts of objections to be overcome so there had to be a compromise arrangement.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: But how can you get past this order in council of the government of Canada?

Mr. COLLEY: The people we would bring in would not be Hungarians or Germans or Austrians or Roumanians; we cannot get by that.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Who are you bringing from those countries then?

Mr. COLLEY: We bring people only from the displaced persons camps in Germany, Austria and Italy; some of those people, many of them, may be Yugoslavs, or Czechoslovaks, or citizens of other countries, but nobody in those displaced persons camps at the present time who belong to those nationalities which were former enemy aliens, we cannot touch them at all at the present time.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Irrespective of whether they be anti-Nazi or not?

Mr. COLLEY: Irrespective of whether they be anti-Nazi or not.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There are five thousand people on your master list?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And they all have relatives here in Canada?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is there any reason why you should not gather those five thousand people together and get a couple of ships and bring them over?

Mr. COLLEY: Of course, they are not all approved; the approvals go over at the rate of three or four at a time; and lining them up is a little bit difficult.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Why cannot you take those who are approved and bring them over?

Mr. COLLEY: Our men are working on that as fast as they can do it. We have teams over there selecting them, and they have to be brought from twenty to thirty different districts.

The CHAIRMAN: We are glad to have heard from you and we may have to ask you to come back again.

Mr. COLLEY: Thank you and I will be glad to come back.

Mr. COLLEY, the Witness, retired at this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Now we have Mr. Ian MacKay, a former UNRRA worker in Germany, called:

Mr. MacKAY: Honourable senators, I am not here in any official position, yet I should like to think that I had in one sense of the word, an official position, because I am here representing some 800,000 displaced persons in Europe and

in particular the displaced persons in the British zone of Germany which I know pretty well, and several hundred UNRRA workers who made a great contribution to the work of UNRRA in Germany for the relief of the suffering of the displaced persons.

I had the privilege a month or so ago of speaking to a group of senators and members of Parliament, but I shall not enlarge on what I said at that time, because my time is short.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Who is this gentleman, and who does he speak for?

Mr. MacKAY: I was with the Canadian Air Force as a Protestant Chaplain and in 1945, I went to Germany with UNRRA, where I worked with them for several years and served until the first of this year. I do not represent any particular group; I am here at the request of Senator Wilson and I would like you to think of me as representing the displaced persons in the British zone of Germany and I would like to make a plea for them, in addition to the several hundred UNRRA workers who have made a magnificent contribution to the relief of suffering in Europe.

The problem of the displaced person is one which has confronted us for some time and one which still remains unsolved. As time goes on, the urgency for its solution becomes all the greater. The position of the displaced person in Europe is not getting better, it is becoming worse; and I would like to read to you an excerpt from a letter I received last week from Germany from Miss Elsie Moyle. She writes as follows:—

. . . . You will not be at all surprised to learn of course that things are worse than when you withdrew. The D.P's sit on in their camps and we appear to do so little for them. I think that most of us struggle along hoping that occasionally we manage to get something over that helps someone, but it is pretty deadly business. During the early months of winter, most of our D.P's were shunted unmercifully around the country under a plan to hand back as much accommodation as possible to house refugees. Necessary, but hardly humane, as some of them suffered five moves in three months. Repatriation in this region topped the zone, and some heavy wars went on to maintain a reasonable standard in repatriation trains. Repatriation was finally stopped until the weather improved, just after Christmas, because several people were frozen to death both on the boat from Lubeck and the trains from Hesslingen. As the Germans take over more and more responsibility for their own economy, the effort to maintain any of the D.P's rights, if you can call them that, is intensified, and life seems to be a constant inquiry as to why this or why that. The D.P's are on exactly the same rations as the Germans, except that their issue of food is regular and that of the Germans is not, and very shortly they will be required to pay for their food and lodging and go to work. . . .

*Excerpt from letter to Mr. Ian MacKay,  
from Miss Elsie Moyle, UNRRA, H.Q.,  
North Rhine, Westphalia Prov., Iserlohn,  
Germany.*

The reference to the refugees was in respect to the German refugees coming from Poland and Sudetenland and so on. Our refugees were shifted all around the country to make room for the German refugees. That is a letter which came out from Germany and which I received last week. You can see from that the urgency to find some solution for these people.

Now I would like to say a word about the types of people. Since I returned from Germany, I have been doing a great deal of speaking to various bodies and groups; the opinion of the majority of the people in Canada, I think, is

not quite clear as to the types of people which we have in Germany. I think I had the same opinion when I went into Germany, thinking that I was going to work with an undesirable group of people who had been exploited and looted by the Nazis. To my surprise I found that was not so. I have met many of them, some of the most cultured and some of the finest people I have ever met in my life. Morally their standards are extremely high, despite the horror which they went through on the part of the Nazis. They come from all walks of life, from the peasant labourer to the highest walks of university life. Particularly do I have in mind one person who came from Lithuania where he was a Research Professor of Botany in a particular university there, and he was also Dean of the Faculty and writer of note, not only in his own country, but abroad as well. I have letters from him striving to make some contact with people who can get him out of the country. For instance, in Hamburg, we were able to set up a Baltic university which was completely staffed by Baltic professors and the equipment used was equipment which was looted by the Germans out of those Baltic countries; and we secured that equipment and set it up. We have several hundred Baltic students who are undergoing university courses. The same thing can be said of the Ukrainians and of the other people.

One of our problems with the Poles was the fact that we had no teachers fully qualified to teach them because there was a mass repatriation of educational people back to Poland. You can go on all through the various categories and walks of life and you will find the leaders there in Germany; you will find skilled and unskilled labour. We expected that a country would come and ask us for persons of certain skill, so, with that in mind, we built up an employment index in which every displaced person in the camp was classified according to a personnel record which gives you not only the particular trade or skill, but also the degree of skill obtained in those particular trades. I have a sample of this here, if any of you would like to see it, because it was of the utmost importance. Anybody requiring skilled or unskilled labour can go into any UNRRA camp in Germany and say: I would like to know the number of people you have who are skilled people; and you will find it there on this index, on these index cards.

We did that, first of all, to get a very clear picture of the type of people we had to deal with so far as the occupation was concerned. Previously we could not get displaced persons employed at all in Germany. Then the German shortage of labour came along, due to the lack of food, so we were able to get displaced persons work. Practically every male was employed around the city of Hanover working either with the military government, some with UNRRA and some in logging industries; some in the peat bogs, and a number in the German economy, where they worked under the supervision of one of their own nationals. And the second reason for developing the employment index was that we expected that the country would be calling for labour and that we should have full information for them. When this was finished, all these people were screened for their political views. Teams consisting of UNRRA personnel and military government personnel went throughout the camps and every person in the camp was screened. Each person was required to fill out a form, a questionnaire, which was highly secret. Nobody knew what it was. But the key to the solution of any particular questionnaire was held by the Director of the team. If there was any doubt at all as to a man's eligibility, or for his UNRRA care or for his political views, a further key was held by a person at a higher level; so you just transferred the questionnaire to that person, and so it went on. So, at present, in any camp in Germany, so far as UNRRA is concerned, and those associations working with



UNRRA, they have been thoroughly screened as to their political views. They are definitely anti-Nazi and most certainly anti-Communist in every sense of the word. It is an extremely urgent problem and I present it to you who are sitting in committee on this particular problem.

It is easy to find reasons why we cannot accept people in Canada; we can say: labour services and shipping, but it goes beyond that. In my humble estimation, we have a very definite moral obligation towards those people who have suffered at the hands of those whom we have defeated on the battle fields and we, who live in this great and glorious country that has been blessed by God, have a very definite obligation towards these people to accept them, where we can, and to place them in our industries. And I venture to say, if this case were placed before our Canadian people as a whole, I have no doubt that our Canadian people would receive whole families, they would accept full and complete responsibility for any number of people coming to us from Europe, just because they feel a moral obligation towards them. Now I would be happy to answer any questions that I can answer.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Of these displaced persons, how many would be complete families; would the father, mother and children be there in the camp, the whole group together?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, where they were able to locate each other; but there are numerous cases where we are still seeking and searching out the relatives of families of certain people. And where we were able to locate them, we gave them as much of a family environment as possible in those particular conditions.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You have not got the figures as to complete families?

Mr. MacKAY: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But there are plenty of them?

Mr. MacKAY: I would say that the majority of them would be in favour of their being families, although there are large numbers of single people, and we have a number of persons whom we call unaccompanied children, whose parents could not be located, and whom we assumed were dead or had been killed. I would think that in the whole of Germany there are five thousand to eight thousand of them; they are definitely unaccompanied children. In the British zone we located, roughly, two thousand of these children. With many of them, if you traced back as far as you could, you found no information about them; so you labelled them: nationality unknown.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Have you questioned these people as to whether they wish to emigrate? Do you know where they wish to emigrate to?

Mr. MacKAY: These people would emigrate to Canada and the United States.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: That is their desire?

Mr. MacKAY: Practically every desire but one. When I went into a camp I was continually asked about Canada and the possibility of coming to Canada; and upon occasion, petitions giving, perhaps, two or three hundred names of single people and families who want to come to this country, were handed in.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: And would they have had relatives in Canada?

Mr. MacKAY: I would say that some of these Ukrainian people would have relatives in Canada, but not a great number of those people from the Baltic countries.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: So, under the present regulations and government policy, it is almost impossible to bring them in.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There are very few Balts in this country.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Can you say whether many Balts are going into Germany and living there and leaving their own country?



Mr. MacKAY: The Baltic people suffered under two occupations, both by the Soviet people and by the Germans.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: They were fleeing from both.

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, UNRRA's policy was always repatriation for the Poles.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Why mass repatriation for the Poles; I thought that the Pole would be the last man in the world to go back home to his former home.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: You mentioned mass deportation for return to Poland from Germany.

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, UNRRA's policy was always repatriation for the Poles; I thought that the Pole would be the last man in the world to go back home to his former home.

Mr. MacKAY: In the early days we had no information whatever from Poland; there was very definitely a curtain drawn at the Polish border. Then we began receiving into Germany a part of the Warsaw Red Cross who came to us with very definite information as to what was happening in Poland; and it was then that UNRRA and the military governments took a very definite stand on repatriation, and gave, I believe, encouragement to those people to be repatriated. I would say that Poland has a greater population now than ever before. At the end of last year Poland was receiving back into Poland the people of the first and third categories. They would not receive back people who were Nazi and who were of very definite German sympathy. Those were the only people whom the Poles would not accept. But in one week alone something like two hundred of the non-acceptable people went back into Germany.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Would they make application to go back?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, and they went back as displaced persons, although in the true sense of the word they were not displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Was the territory they went back to former German territory and not Polish?

Mr. MacKAY: Some of it was; they were given every encouragement to go back.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Brigadier Drury has just come back; and he said that whereas conditions are very hard, he was not altogether hopeless about the situation in Poland. He has been over there as the UNRRA officer in charge and he thinks there is a little more freedom. He said that the Y.M.C.A. is operating and that the Roman Catholics are operating too, but to a limited extent.

Mr. MacKAY: The great majority of the Polish people who were in Germany were of the peasant type and they were farmed out on these large estates, so there was no reason why they should not go back, because they were not implicated politically at all; and besides that, the large estates were taken over by the government and subdivided; and as farmers went back, they got a plot of land of their own.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Has the UNRRA organization made definite approaches to the government of Canada and the United States with respect to the mass immigration?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, I would say they had.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: And with what result?

Mr. MacKAY: There has been practically no result. Any recent information which I have had from Germany was that the only representative of any government which had made any definite effort in Germany, so far as going

into the camps and seeing the type of people there, and so on, in an official capacity, has been Brazil. So far as immigration to their country is concerned, Brazil is the only one.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Would you consider that your work would be assisted if the government of Canada were to set aside the order in council which prevents nationals in Germany, Austria, and Italy from coming here at the present time?

Mr. McKAY: I do not think so.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: That is an international agreement and we cannot alter it.

Hon. Mr. McQUIRE: No, but I am referring to the order in council.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: But that is not the barrier to it.

Mr. MacKAY: No.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: The barrier is the policy which is laid down by the government, that no one can be admitted without permission.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I heard about a suicide just the other day.

Mr. MacKAY: Yes. These people from the Ukraine and the Baltic countries, if there is any effort made to send them back and to recognize them as citizens of the Soviet, all these people have suicide pacts, and they carry razor blades with them; and if the time ever came when we said: you are citizens of the Soviet and under the Yalta agreement you must go back, we would have nothing but mass suicides in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN: The Immigration Department says: in the first place, they are citizens of Hungary and thus they are enemy aliens.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: There are many applications with the Department of Immigration to-day from Italy, Hungary and many other countries, and they are refused and cannot be considered. So, if your organization can bring them in, notwithstanding that, I would consider that you had some special understanding with the government of Canada.

Mr. MacKAY: UNRRA does not assume any responsibility in the case of enemy nationals.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Then, who can you bring from Germany to-day?

Mr. MacKAY: Well, you have got Polish people, Yugoslavs, Lithuanians, White Russians, Jewish people who are definitely not ex-enemy nationals.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: Those who have come just of late, the last fifty or sixty odd, would they come under that clause?

Mr. MacKAY: They were displaced persons; that was the first group that arrived in Canada, I think; and I think I am quite right in saying that the Ukrainian people and the Mennonites in Canada will assume the full responsibility for those people, when they come in.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: It seems to me with respect to the government's restrictions, that most of those people were good meaning people and highly desirable people, and it seems unfair. You may have a very desirable citizen from Germany, but we cannot get him in here. If we took some from Germany that would relieve some of the pressure. It seems to me that the government should take that off and leave it to the Germans as a whole; or the people. They are not responsible for what happened, I believe.

Mr. MacKAY: It is a matter of relatives. These are the people who suffered.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: They all suffered.

Mr. MacKAY: Any suffering in Germany was brought upon the Germans by themselves; and after a year and half in Germany, I do not think the Germans are prepared to accept one bit of responsibility for what happened.

In the early days our biggest trouble was to maintain any rights whatsoever for our allied nationals in comparison with the rights and privileges of the Germans who were the defeated people; and we are the people who liberated these persons from slave labour camps and from concentration camps, and we have got them in Germany and have kept them there for several years now and we are giving them absolutely no consolation or no solution to the problem; so they are becoming frustrated and hopeless and they are becoming demoralized, because they have no hope. If only we could go to them and say; we will take a certain number of you in a year's time, it would give them some hope.

We did send certain numbers of them back to the Soviet Union at the point of the bayonet in the early days. We should not force them back. Under the Yalta agreement, the Soviet people are the only ones who can be forced to go back.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The Soviet seems to have had a lot to do with this; but the German people as a whole, from a humane point of view, it was hard for them to resist Hitlerism or Naziism that they were up against. Now that it is over, and in order to make the world peaceful and happy, they should be allowed to carry on with the rest of them as much as possible. That is just my point of view.

The CHAIRMAN: It is now 12.35 and we are sorry, but we have to conclude and are sorry that we cannot give you more time, Mr. MacKay.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I would like to have this witness return because there are a lot of very important questions that might be asked and I think that he could give us a lot of information. I gather that he has a very clear understanding of these problems of displaced persons, and it is one of the duties of this committee to try to find a solution for this specific problem and to make very strong representations to the government to have it fully adopted, and in the Chamber, and to give it some publicity.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that this gentleman, Mr. MacKay, is a minister from Toronto, now, and that he came down here at the request of our colleague, the honourable Senator Wilson, and it is just too bad that he has not had more time to present his views to us today, but we want to complete this hearing at 12.30.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Could we not hear him after the adjournment later this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN: If that is agreeable to you?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I should think we would be through by 4.30, when the Senate rises or whenever the Senate rises.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, we will now adjourn until Senate rises this afternoon, when we will meet here again. Thank you.

The Committee adjourned at 12.40 p.m., to meet again today after the Senate rises from its afternoon session.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

OTTAWA, April 24, 1947.

The Committee resumed at 4.40 p.m.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, I think we have a quorum now; we have eight senators here.

The CHAIRMAN: No; there are only five members of the committee present, so we shall wait for a minute or two.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, we heard a few minutes' address by Mr. MacKay before we adjourned, and then our time being very limited, you suggested that we should reassemble this afternoon to hear a continuation. Now there are quite a number of senators here who did not hear the opening remarks.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Do not look at me; I heard them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, I know; so I would suggest to the speaker that he give us some idea of what he said this morning, not necessarily to repeat all of it, but to give us an idea. So, if he would just tell us again what he knows about these displaced persons camps in Europe and so on, commencing more or less ab initio.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you just give us a brief outline indicating the length of your term of service in Germany and telling us what you were doing.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the witness explain just who these displaced persons are because there seems to be some doubt in the minds of some of us as to whether they are Germans or just who they are.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And let us know their ages and sex, whether they are young women or older women and so on.

Mr. MACKAY: Displaced persons are persons of allied nationality who had been displaced by reason of the war; and the ones to whom I was referring particularly were the persons in Germany who were brought in there by the Nazis to carry on their slave labour policy. Many of them ended up in concentration camps and we liberated them in May, 1945. They cover, predominantly, the Poles, the Ukrainian people, the Yugoslavs, and the Baltic people; and in that group I have not included the Jews who are considered as a separate group. Despite the fact of their countries of origin, be they Polish or Yugoslavie, they are considered as Jews; and that is the way they consider themselves; those are the displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And the actual number of them, outside of the Jews, is 850,000?

Mr. MACKAY: Including the Jews.

The CHAIRMAN: How many Jews are there?

Mr. MACKAY: It is difficult to give you an accurate estimate of the Jews, but I would say, perhaps, 150,000 of Jewish personnel.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I have heard it stated as being ten per cent.

Mr. MACKAY: Yes, of the 850,000.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Ten per cent of the 850,000 represent Jews and the balance would be Protestants or Roman Catholics?



Mr. MACKAY: Yes, and a lot of Jews have come into Germany from Poland and other parts of Europe, whom we call infiltrees, not displaced persons. They came after the war under apparently a very definite scheme, that they would leave their countries of origin and enter Germany. At the present time there are about 10,000 of them in Belsen.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You mean they are in the concentration camp at Belsen?

Mr. MACKAY: No, not in the concentration camp, but in the military barracks of the concentration camp, and they number roughly 10,000; and of that number, I could not say how many infiltrees and how many were actually displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Were you connected with the Inter-Governmental Committee?

Mr. MACKAY: In no way, sir. I was connected entirely with UNRRA and I acted as Chief Welfare Officer for the province of Hanover, and latterly Field Supervisor with Headquarters in Hanover.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And you are a Chaplain?

Mr. MACKAY: No, I was a welfare worker which had nothing whatever to do with the religious side of the work, although religion is part of welfare.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Under UNRRA?

Mr. MACKAY: Under UNRRA, yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Senator Haig asked you what sort of people these were.

Senator HAIG: Yes, I wanted to know the age and type and that sort of thing.

Mr. MACKAY: The ages vary, of course, but there are large numbers of young people, single and married, and I would say that the majority of them are in the middle-age group, families.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What would you say about their skills?

Mr. MACKAY: Their skills cover practically anything you can suggest. As I mentioned this morning, we had this employment index drawn up which gives you an indication of the type of persons we had. It is drawn up into ten classifications covering all the trades, both skilled and professional, and that is broken down again.

The CHAIRMAN: That document will be included in our records, will it not?

Mr. MACKAY: Well, if you wish it; it is not a complete report; it is a report concerning my own area in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it would be interesting to us.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It concerns individual men, does it not?

Mr. MACKAY: No, it is in statistical form. For instance, under administration, clerical, commercial, I would look at "A-1" and then I would turn over here where I see "A-1" where I have 80 Poles, that 80 men, and 46 women who are accountants and auditors or bookkeepers. Then I go along and I see Latvians, for instance, 215 men and 21 women; Lithuania, 123 and 121, and so on; it goes through all the classifications of skills, clerks, salesmen, draftsmen, electricians, engineers, farmers, dairymen, and so on. It would be a study of about 300,000 people. This report covers roughly, 300,000.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: It does?

Mr. MACKAY: Yes; this covers all of Hanover province. This covers only the employable males and females.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: It does not cover children?

Mr. MACKAY: No.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Just displaced persons?

Mr. MACKEY: Yes; and this was drawn up by an American Employment officer who knew the routine from end to end; and the cards were kept in the various camps and all you had to do was to ask for the number of skilled people in a particular field and they would look up the proper cards and tell you everything about them. They would tell you the degree of skill and everything. That service is available to anybody who desires to go into Germany and to select these people.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I think you have stated to-day the only people, as a government, who have made any use of this service was Brazil.

Mr. MACKEY: Yes; that is the only government who have been seen in Germany with that end in view.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And has there been an actual movement of the people from these displaced persons camps to Brazil?

Mr. MACKEY: No, not in any large number; Brazil was going to take 20,000, but I think the number finally got cut down to say 3,000 or 4,000.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I believe that this report ought to be filed; it is a survey from Hanover province of 300,000 people of working age and it gives the skills and possibilities within that area.

The CHAIRMAN: If we could get somebody to analyse it and put in down, so that it would be simplified. Do you see how that could be done?

Mr. MACKEY: It could be done and condensed into a more readable form than it is at the present time; there will be no difficulty in doing that, but it is a very interesting document and if you would like to see it, I should be happy to pass it over because it gives you a complete picture of the type of people that you have in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us know later what you think about condensing and printing it. Now, will you proceed please.

Mr. MACKEY: I think, if you would like to understand something about conditions under which these people are required to live at the present time, you will be interested to know that there were three types of accommodation used for displaced persons. The first type was the military barracks of the Germans, and there are many of them in Germany. By and large they were good; some were bombed very badly, for instance, Belsen, which is a very large military barracks, but nevertheless it is in very good condition, and such a camp offers very good facilities for the care of the displaced persons, as far as feeding was concerned, but as to housing except for one instance the rooms tended to be too small and, when there was a fairly large family it brought about fairly crowded conditions. We lost some of those barracks because the British began training their own troops in Germany, so we had to vacate some of them; but we did keep the bombed barracks and we did keep the Belsen barracks. The second type of accommodation which is most usual in Germany was the slave labour camps, which were just long low wooden huts, very much the shape of this room. Sometimes they were in quite good condition and other times they were in very very bad condition. These were camps in which the Germans required the slave labourers to live during the war and, naturally, they were not very much concerned about repairs. Foreign labour was living in there and the repairs would not be kept up at all. The majority of them have been repaired to the extent so far as supplies were available; but glass was not available; lumber was not available; nails were not available in any quantity with which to repair these buildings, with the result that they were scarcely liveable.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You mentioned slave labourers now.

Mr. MACKEY: They are the same group of people; these are the people whom the Nazis brought into Germany to work in their factories and mines.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: What proportion of these displaced persons in Germany now would you call slave labourers.

Mr. MacKAY: Outside of the Balts, you could call them all; and there were about 150,000 Balts.

The CHAIRMAN: But you call them refugees now?

Mr. MacKAY: No, they are all displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They are the same people who were the slave labour people?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You say that the Balts were not slave labourers?

Mr. MacKAY: Not to the same degree as the Ukrainians and the Poles; they did not come into Germany until late in 1945, the Balts.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: These people won't go back home?

Mr. MacKAY: Our policy was repatriation for the Poles, and I gave you the reason why Poland requires her people; and they have been prepared to accept for some time the people, that is, those Poles who may have had a German father or a German mother, and they will accept them in classes or categories No. 2 and No. 3, but not in the first class which is really a German, one who is considered by the Nazis as being a pure Aryan, as far as the other groups are concerned. For instance, the Yugoslavs, they will not go back because of the political situation and implications in Yugoslavia; they are Royalists, and as you know, there is no monarchy in Yugoslavia; and because of their fear of the political regime in Yugoslavia, they absolutely refuse to go back. And when you come to the Balts, the same thing holds true there; three Baltic countries have been occupied by the Soviets since 1944, so they are now considered as the Baltic Republics of the Soviet Union; and these people refuse to go back while the Soviets are in control of those countries. We have not as yet recognized, as United Nations, the occupation of the three Baltic countries by the Soviet Union. Whether we do or not, I do not know; and these people absolutely refuse to go back.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: We have not dared to do so?

Mr. MacKAY: We have, apparently, ignored it so far; these people have refused to go back.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: What is the physical condition of these people?

Mr. MacKAY: The physical condition of the displaced persons is very, very good; I think it is quite true to say of the Poles that their health in Germany is better than it was, that is, the average in Germany is better and higher than it was in their own country because they have been cared for not only by their own medical people, but by the medical people under supervision of UNRRA; and the same is true of the other groups.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: And do they do any kind of work?

Mr. MacKAY: In the early days it was quite impossible to get displaced persons to work. In the first place they were not so keen on working themselves; they had been working for six or seven years, fourteen to seventeen hours a day, for the Germans on a diet of a bowl of watery soup, so they felt that they ought not to work; but through the type of program we built up in our camps, they came to a stage where they were ready to work; but we could not get them work because of the German situation. Then, when the German rations were so reduced that the Germans themselves could not work there went out a cry from the military government for displaced persons labourers. Then we came up against the problem of their working in the German economy because they refused to work under the supervision of a German national. So, when we got them work in the factories or on some project of some kind, which was purely German, we had to put in as a supervisor over that group a straw-boss



who was a Pole and who in turn took his orders from Germans and passed them on. That solved that particular problem. At the present time practically every employable male who can work is working in Germany, and that also includes your doctors, your nurses and your welfare people. There are some people, if you go through that document, whom you just could not place in a position of any kind because of their particular training and skill; so they are working in positions of responsibility in the camp, or they are working with the UNRRA teams, or with the military government. For instance, I had a labour office in Hanover where I had the resident engineer for the government of Latvia, who was in charge of all repairs and construction of the displaced persons camp in that area; and he had two of his chief assistants from Latvia as well who were working with him. But what the displaced person feels is that, although he may work and realize that work is good for him, he sees no future in it because he is assisting in the rebuilding of Germany, by which he has suffered and for him it has no security or future. Therefore, those who are working and continuing to work do it because they realize that there is a certain dignity that comes to one who does work. Besides that at the present time, the rations have been cut down to something like 1,500 calories a day. The German ration was 1,150 calories a day up to October, when it went up to 1,500; and while displaced persons were getting around 1,800, they had to come down to the German 1,500, so now there is no difference in the rations they are getting; they are the same rations so far as caloric strength is concerned. Miss Moyle spoke in her letter about the only difference in connection with the displaced persons was the fact that they receive their rations regularly, because of the German production, the first claim is food for displaced persons; but they are practically on the same level in every other way; and in many instances they are underprivileged, and are required to meet the regulations of the camps.

Whereas the German can get out and live in his own home or in rented quarters, he has that freedom to build up and continue his family life; on the other hand the displaced person cannot; and while the German person can go out under the German economy and buy from the stores or whatever there is in the line of foodstuffs, and in accordance with his ration card, on the other hand a displaced person cannot do so; he just receives his ration.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: This is all administered by the UNRRA organization?

Mr. MACKAY: Yes, but assisted by the British Red Cross, the Guides and Scouts, the Salvation Army, and the Quakers.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Why would there be that restriction on the displaced persons?

Mr. MACKAY: Well, up to July, 1945, he could live outside the camp, provided he could find accommodation in the German town, city or village, and he could draw his ration from the nearest UNRRA camp. But in July, a regulation came out from the military government that all displaced persons must give up accommodation in town and move into the camp; that there must be no more living in private; and the only people excluded from that were the people working with UNRRA, the people working with the military government, and people working at some piece of work whereby their living in the camp or going into the camp would limit the contribution or effectiveness of the job; or the people who were able to get a medical certificate that they were not in fit condition to live in the camps.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What was the purpose of that ruling?

Mr. MACKAY: To keep displaced persons in a group separate from the Germany economy completely; and another was, I think to stop all black market operations, where that was rife. The displaced persons would get a certain amount of rations and he would exchange with a German for something which he might have, such as fresh fruit or vegetables, something which he was not



always getting himself. Now, if we had a camp here, and there was accommodation for say, thirty people, and you have seventy-people working outside, or living outside, you told those people and you gave them seven days within which they must get into the camp; and if they refused to come into the camp accommodations which were available, then they lost their displaced persons status. And you may recall having seen an item in the newspapers about that time which had to do with or affected five hundred Jews in the city of Hanover, who were under my supervision, because they refused to move into the camps, and they lost their displaced persons status and so were considered as German civilians.

The CHAIRMAN: And did they later sail for Palestine? Is that some of them?

Mr. MacKAY: Not that I know; I should not think so, in that group, but I do not know; I would imagine perhaps some of them might be on their way.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Have these people any resources of their own; should we bring some of them to this country, would they have any resources, or would they have to be a charge upon the government here?

Mr. MacKAY: They have no resources, because they have lost them. The bulk of the people came with nothing except the clothes that they wore. The Ukrainians and the others, when they worked for the Germans were paid with German marks which have value only in Germany; they cannot be paid in any other currency; they could not open up accounts and hold them in reserve in Germany and then transfer them out of that country. They get paid in German currency which is of no value to them; and they cannot spend it because there is nothing to buy in Germany. Therefore, they do not see why they should work. But if there was some way by which we could credit them or give them credit in Canada or the United States, or even South America, or if they could hold it as a reserve and bring it in to our country as a credit, it would be quite different; but it is just a waste of money so far as they are concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: What do you think the solution of the whole problem should be; and remember, you do not have to answer this question unless you want to?

Mr. MacKAY: My solution of the whole problem—the only solution to the problem, as I see it, is for the countries who can accept people, such as Canada, to do so, because they are morally obligated to accept them; and if we cannot place them in Canada in jobs immediately, then I am quite convinced that the Canadian people are big enough and great enough to assume that responsibility, if the case is put to them fairly and squarely.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What has been done up to date to shoulder our share of the responsibility, or to signify our willingness to do so?

Mr. MacKAY: As far as I know, there is little.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And what is the alternative?

Mr. MacKAY: Either leave them in Germany or send them back to their countries by force.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And if you should send them back to Yugoslavia or to the Baltic countries at the present time, what happens to them?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You said this morning that they are prepared to commit suicide.

Mr. MacKAY: That is right; they won't go back.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: If he had met the representatives of Yugoslavia at the United Nations, he would know what would happen; I met them and I have to tell you that I wouldn't like to meet them after dark.

The CHAIRMAN: Siberia and slave labour?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: What is your title, is it Major MacKay?

Mr. MacKAY: No, it is really Squadron Leader, but they call me Mister, usually.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Well, I shall call you Mister. What, in your judgment, would be the fate of these people, if they were to be sent back to Estonia and Lithuania? They are anti-Communist and anti-Nazi?

Mr. MacKAY: Only one thing would happen to them, I think. If you gentlemen have not already read it, you might read a recent article in "Time" magazine which gives the story of some of the refugees, some of the people who have escaped from those countries.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I have read it.

Mr. MacKAY: Well, that is the answer. I think we have to face the fact, whether we can get proof or not, that Russia is a totalitarian country, where the individual amounts to absolutely nothing except inasmuch as he is of value to the State and as long as he falls in line with what the State wants him to do. These people are free thinkers. Their whole attitude towards life is one of democracy, and they cannot possibly live under such a regime. That is why they are in Germany and that is why they refuse to go back from Germany.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You do not mean to say they are free thinkers as we use the term?

Mr. MacKAY: No. They use their own minds. They are educated and cultured people; they will think through a problem with all of its implications and come to a decision of their own; they are not the type to whom you can say: you sit on that pedestal and I will tell you what to do.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: They are not Atheists?

Mr. MacKAY: No, not in that sense of the word; they are most devout, the most religious people I have ever seen. I shall never forget the first service that I was able to arrange for a group of Ukrainian people outside the city of Brunswick, which was the first service they had been able to have for years without interruption and without fear of persecution of any kind; and to see them walk into that building which was set up as a chapel, that was something I shall never forget, and their joy at being able to participate in their own form of worship. I happened to see them some months later, and that was the only thing they remembered about me, that I was the one who got them their priest and gave them their chapel.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I understand there are 700,000 or 800,000 of those people in the British zones.

Mr. MacKAY: Yes. There will be that number after the repatriation of all the Poles who can be repatriated, and that should be finished I think, about the middle of the summer, in June or July. In October or November of last year, over 60,000 were repatriated.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: They went back voluntarily to Poland?

Mr. MacKAY: Voluntarily. You might be interested to know that large numbers of military personnel from Poland were going back.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: Do you know how many Poles have been repatriated in the last six months?

Mr. MacKAY: I have the figures for October, November and December; about 70,000 people went back.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: In those three months.

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, We initiated a programme in November whereby Polish persons who were going back would get 60 days of rations; and they got their rations at the Port of Gdynia. UNRRA set up warehouses, where each person who was going back could get sixty days rations; and that happened to

speed repatriation. But because of the severity of winter, that process was stopped, and according to the letter which I read to you this morning, several people got frozen to death en route because of the weather. I have that letter with me now and I will read it to you again. This letter is from a New Zealand lady who worked with me as a welfare officer and in whom I have the utmost confidence as far as her judgment and wisdom are concerned. I received this letter last week and it was written in the latter part of March. She writes as follows:—

... You will not be at all surprised to learn of course that things are worse than when you withdrew. The D.P.'s sit on in their camps and we appear to do so little for them. I think that most of us struggle along hoping that occasionally we manage to get something over that helps someone, but it is pretty deadly business. During the early months of winter, most of our D.P.'s were shunted unmercifully around the country under a plan to hand back as much accommodation as possible to house refugees. Necessary, but hardly humane, as some of them suffered five moves in three months. Repatriation in this region topped the zone, and some heavy wars went on to maintain a reasonable standard in repatriation trains. Repatriation was finally stopped until the weather improved, just after Christmas, because several people were frozen to death both on the boat from Lubeck and the trains from Hesslingen. As the Germans take over more and more responsibility for their own economy, the effort to maintain any of the D.P.'s rights, if you can call them that, is intensified, and life seems to be a constant inquiry as to why this or why that. The D.P.'s are on exactly the same rations as the Germans, except that their issue of food is regular and that of the Germans is not, and very shortly they will be required to pay for their food and lodging and go to work...

I explained that the reference to refugees was that the thousands of people being sent into Germany, or coming into Germany and they are the responsibility of the German Administration and Welfare Organization. They are housed in German villages where that is possible, and by now there are so many of them they just take over any accommodation whatsoever, so our displaced persons were shunted back and forth into various camps, so that there would be room for the refugees. Miss Moyle was writing from what we used to call No. 1 Corps, the north line, Westphalia province. The Germans were assuming the full responsibility for the railroads in Germany and even when I left there, it was a struggle to keep up any kind of standards on these trains. Remember that people would be on them for three or four days at a time and there was not even straw to sit on.

HON. MR. CRERAR: How many of them are in the American zones?

MR. MACKAY: The figure for the British zone was roughly 400,000; but there were not that many in the American zones. I think it was roughly around 300,000; and the French is less than the American.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Was the UNRRA organization looking after these people, and have they formulated any plans for handling the matter beyond the present time?

MR. MACKAY: No; I think they have worked in with the government who are interested and so on, but they themselves have no such authority under the charter.

THE CHAIRMAN: When does their supervision end?

MR. MACKAY: They close at the end of June when the International Refugee Organization, which is the organ of the United Nations, should take over; but how far they have got on even with the organization of the IRO, I do not know.



They have not begun to record personnel, according to the last that I heard, so, they will fold up at the end of June; and my information from Germany is that they just do not know what is happening.

Hon. Mr. McINTYRE: Was it not extended from the 31st of March on down?

Mr. MacKAY: IRO was supposed to be ready at the end of the year 1945, but it was not; and it has been extended to June.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: June. Unless some other organization takes over, these people are left at the mercy of the Germans?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: What is the attitude of the Germans towards the displaced persons?

Mr. MacKAY: The general attitude is: they are foreigners, and when are they going home. They feel no responsibility for them whatsoever, just as they feel no responsibility towards their own refugees coming in.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: What do they call them?

Mr. MacKAY: Expellees, that is, people who have been expelled from Poland, from Yugoslavia, and so on.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: Are there any figures available as to how many displaced persons have been accepted by other countries since the war has been over?

Mr. MacKAY: Oh, I would say it was negligible; some of them; there are no figures available, but I think that England has taken 2,000 or 3,000 Baltic girls as domestics or as ward aids in sanatoria and so on; and I think that is something which ought to make us hang our heads in shame to think that England, with its terrific problem, has gone and taken these people, despite the fact that she has millions of displaced persons who went to England and whom she accepted long before the war began. I remember standing on an important street corner in London and I was astounded at the number of persons who came through who were refugees in England, and who came to inquire about relatives and conditions on the continent, while we in Canada have taken practically none. We ought to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves in this great dominion of ours. We like to call ourselves great, but we forget that with greatness goes responsibility.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: This morning, I think, some mention was made of the Mennonites, or displaced persons?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, they would come under the Ukrainian group, or those of undetermined nationalities.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I asked a moment ago about the movement out of Europe to some other country and we mentioned Brazil. Have you heard of a movement to Paraguay of displaced Mennonites?

Mr. MacKAY: I think it was Senator Crerar who mentioned that to me last time I was here.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I am familiar with it. I know one of the Bishops of the Mennonite church in my own district who accompanied that ship-load of Mennonites down there. And the Mennonites in Canada and the United States were quite prepared to take them in here and find homes for them, so that they would not be a charge, but they were not allowed to come in here; so they had to go to Paraguay; and I talked to one of the officials who told me that he had no difficulty whatever in getting a boat, and that he could take another boatload and bring them to Canada, if Canada would allow them to come in. They are displaced persons.

Mr. MacKAY: Oh, yes; they would be of the Ukrainian group.



Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Has anyone from UNRRA organization made any effort to persuade the governments to take these people in?

Mr. MacKAY: All I can tell you is that while in Germany I was in a position of responsibility at various levels, and we did our utmost to impress on those who came to see us. We have a good many people who inspected our camps, both belonging to UNRRA and official visitors. I do not know how far it went with UNRRA, but I was astonished the last time that I addressed the members to find that they did not even know about this document here, and I think I am right in saying that the Minister, the Hon. Mr. Glen, did not even know about it.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: That is my very point; to make this problem known to Immigration officials abroad is nothing; it seems to me that has got to get to the top government officials.

Mr. MacKAY: I know that as far as the classification and the employment index is concerned, that was ready and completed up to August, 1946.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Is that the only solution of this problem? If the country is going to accept any of these people, could you not allot certain numbers to the various countries who are seeking immigrants, and then let them do the selecting? Canada would take 10,000 to 20,000 over a period of time and the other countries would take some as well.

Mr. MacKAY: If we allotted displaced persons in Europe on a percentage basis, on the basis of the contribution of the various paying nations to UNRRA, our problem would be solved. Now, Canada pays, let us say, \$5,000,000; and another country would pay \$1,000,000; so Canada would take five times as many displaced persons as the one who pays but \$1,000,000, and we could work it out on a contributory basis.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know how many that would involve for Canada?

Mr. MacKAY: Perhaps Senator Turgeon would know.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: It would go fairly high on that basis, particularly unless the United States should set aside her quota of regulations and take in her full number that would be given her, because the United States pays away over half of the ordinary sum; so if the United States would act on that basis and take her full percentage, those required to be taken by Canada would not be overly great; but it would not be possible if the United States would not accede.

Mr. MacKAY: We have been paying into UNRRA now for three or four years and we shall continue to pay into the IRO, but that does not solve the problem so far as displaced persons are concerned. The only solution is to get them out of Germany.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: It is just operating a soup kitchen, I suppose.

Mr. MacKAY: Quite.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: It seems to me that it would take an interminable time to get the other nations to agree with them, and we would all be dead first. It seems to me that Canada should start out on her own and say: we are prepared to take so many of these people.

Mr. MacKAY: That was the root of the resolution that was passed and endorsed by the Liberal Federation when it met here several months ago. I remember that I was with Mr. Walter Tucker at the time the resolution was drawn up and endorsed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What were the terms and the principles?

Mr. MacKAY: We did not get down to principles at all.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: You think there are about 700,000 to 800,000?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: In the European area?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: And if you gave the United States sixty per cent, even that would leave the Canadian government about ten per cent, would it not; and it could be worked out very easily on that basis?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You mean, ten per cent of the whole, or ten per cent of the balance?

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: Of the total.

Mr. MacKAY: If we went to Germany and took our quota of skilled farmers and placed them on some of the vacant farms in the Maritime provinces, it would solve the problem. As you drive through the Maritimes, you see thousands of farms that are vacant, and although the houses on them are not in good condition, they are much better houses than these people are living in, and I think you would see a big difference in a short time.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: How long were you over there?

Mr. MacKAY: Over eighteen months.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: And you had an opportunity to observe them and you think they would make good citizens, Mr. MacKAY?

Mr. MacKAY: I am quite safe in saying that they would. I do not mean that every displaced person is a paragon of virtue; you cannot go into Poland, among several million people, and get all the saints, and neither would you in Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Were you born in Canada?

Mr. MacKAY: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Whereabouts in Canada?

Mr. MacKAY: In the Maritimes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Where did you receive your education?

Mr. MacKAY: In the Maritimes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And where did you graduate from?

Mr. MacKAY: I graduated from Mount Allison University in Sackville, New Brunswick and from Pine Hill Theological school of Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: And you joined the forces as a chaplain in the Air service?

Mr. MacKAY: Yes, sir; I was a navigator in the Canadian Air Force until they transferred me over to the chaplains' branch in 1941; and in May, 1945, the Air Force released me in order to work with UNRRA as a Welfare Officer; and I returned to this country at the first of the year because of ill health.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think we should thank this gentleman for the wonderful presentation he has made to us to-day.

Mr. MacKAY: I have done a lot of speaking on this subject before large and small groups and I found the people in Canada to be totally ignorant of the problem and the type of people that we have been dealing with in Germany.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Have you spoken to anybody of the Cabinet?

Mr. MacKAY: I spoke to about 25 or 30 members of the Senate and House of Commons on one occasion here, and I have talked with various members of the government.

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: Have you been in British Columbia or Alberta?

Mr. MacKAY: Not recently.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You say that the Dominion Government contributes to UNRRA?

Mr. MacKAY: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Who is the link for the Dominion Government in the UNRRA organization? Is there not some official representative who would be top man in the UNRRA organization on behalf of Canada?

Mr. MacKAY: I do not know the liaison officer. I do know that a lot of their work is being done between UNRRA, that is, the headquarters in Washington; it is being done through the Embassy, the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I think you indicated that the report which you have, so far as you know, has not passed into the possession of the government. Is there any official representative of the government, who is supposed to get the report of Canada's part, or who can make recommendations?

Mr. MacKAY: I do not think there is any, to the best of my knowledge. I know that I went to Canada House, before I came home, and I found that they were totally disinterested. They said it was not part of their responsibility.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: But we are contributing money to the organization so we must have a representative on the organization, and that representative or representatives should be making reports to the Canadian government on the expenditure of the money, or as to what they think should be done.

Mr. MacKAY: I do not think there is any set-up like that at all.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Colley is here with us and he is an official representative.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I have been very much impressed with the presentation made, and I know how these things go; a report is made to a body like this, and then it takes so long for the machinery to move that it seems to me, that in view of the emergency here, where this UNRRA organization is going to come to an end this year, in June, that Mr. MacKay should have an opportunity of presenting his case some place where it might receive a little better consideration and be dealt with more quickly than would be done through making a formal report; so it has occurred to me, that this committee should suggest to the Prime Minister that he, along with the leaders of the other two parties, such as Mr. Bracken and Mr. Coldwell, might be prepared to hear Mr. MacKay for a few hours and discuss these problems with him, and at least get the information and know the situation. I feel perfectly certain that they do not know. It seems to me that this thing has to be dealt with at the very top level.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that might embarrass your commitments; would you care to set any date on which to meet the Cabinet?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would support the Hon. Mr. Campbell's recommendation, that we, as a committee, recommend to the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition and the leaders of the other groups, that they invite Mr. MacKay to give them the facts about this situation and let them ask him all the questions they like; so, while it is nothing official, they will have the facts direct, while we have them to-day. I know the three or four gentlemen, personally, well; we all do, and we ought to decide. At the present time we are not coming to any decision at all; we are just making reports that are not always even read.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you be able to carry out an arrangement of that kind, if it were made, Mr. MacKay?

Mr. MacKAY: I would do the best I could; you know, I am working for a living now. If you would give me a day, I would make every arrangement I could to come when they want me to.



Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Should we not, as a committee, get back of Mr. MacKay and help him out? We are putting the whole load on him to go to these men. I think we should appoint a select committee from this group, just two or three, to contact these men, first the Prime Minister and the other leaders, so that the way can be smoothed out for Mr. MacKay to meet them later on. I do not think just a formal recommendation from this committee will do the trick. I think we should make it our business to see that they know, and to arrange the best way for it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, and to pay the expenses. This man has his railway fare and that sort of thing.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Where do you live?

Mr. MACKAY: Toronto.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Are you working there?

Mr. MACKAY: Yes, but I am not worried about the expenses, as long as we can do something.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I move that there be a committee of three, the Chairman, Senator Roebuck, and Senator Haig.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: No, I do not want to act on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Surely, if you want to. Shall I record that as a motion? A motion has been made that Senator Roebuck, Senator Haig and the Chairman be instructed to get in touch with the Prime Minister and the leaders of the several other parties, just the four leaders; I take it that you do not want the Minister of Immigration?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I do not want anybody else there.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, the motion is that the three senators specified get in touch with the four leaders in the other place and undertake to arrange with them to meet and to hear Mr. MacKay in respect to the statements he has made to us to-day. All those in favour say Aye? I declare the motion to be carried.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would take on the responsibility of seeing Mr. Bracken, Mr. Coldwell, and Mr. Low, while you others might take on the responsibility of seeing the Prime Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. James Colley, who is the Canadian Resident Representative of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, spoke to us this morning for a little while and now he would like to speak to us again briefly, so I shall now call upon Mr. Colley.

Mr. MacKay retired as witness and Mr. James Colley again took the stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Colley has a short brief to read to us. This is in addition to what he said to us this morning.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, and it further explains the position which I am in. The previous speaker has indicated that nothing is being done. An organization is to be formed. UNRRA was never in a position to handle immigration and resettlement. Their constitution does not cover that. That will be covered by the IRO; and pending the formation of the IRO, the Intergovernmental Committee is doing that work as far as Canada is concerned. We are bringing over, as fast as we can get the ships, the persons who have been named by the relatives in this country. But it is difficult to get shipping space; however, as fast as we can get it, we are getting it and bringing over relatives. We have been handicapped with regard to getting space, in chartered space, because we have no authority from the Immigration Department to bring them in under a so-called bulk movement, by which we could go and recruit and gather up the

people and bring them in together. So, there has not been as large a movement as there would otherwise have been. There is an organization working as hard as they can on this problem of getting these displaced persons.

The CHAIRMAN: But nothing has been done.

Mr. COLLEY: How do you mean, nothing has been done?

The CHAIRMAN: Have there been any of these people brought in?

Mr. COLLEY: We have brought over the first group, yes.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, fifty.

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, that was all the space that could be got on that steamer.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Well, if we were capable of moving back hundreds of thousands of troops within a few months from the end of the war, I should think that we should be able to find shipping space now, if an effort was made.

Mr. COLLEY: Shipping is mostly under the control of the various governments; the British Ministry of Shipping, the Dutch Ministry of Shipping, and others. Certain of the ships are still moving troops all over the world; and the only ships that we may be able to get are the so-called Liberty ships; efforts are being made ready to get some of them, but they are not, probably, in a fit condition to bring immigrants over in.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Under the present Canadian immigration regulations, is it possible to bring in a bulk shipment of immigrants?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You can only get them in under application made by relatives and so forth?

Mr. COLLEY: No, the latest order in council says that people who are assured of employment are admissible; but they have not yet decided to let us bring those people in under bulk movement; so that is where the stickler is.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: There is a point here that I would like to get clear. I know that within the past year, probably within the last eight months, that an effort was made to bring Mennonites and displaced persons to this country, yet they could not get the arrangements made and, as a result, the Mennonite community in Canada and the United States got a ship and chartered it and took 2,300 of those Mennonites to Paraguay.

Mr. COLLEY: That is true, and the Mennonites are still trying to charter a ship.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Why could not something of that kind be done in this case?

Mr. COLLEY: We are trying to do that.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Does the government stand in the way; is it not the government regulations that stand in the way?

Mr. COLLEY: Yes, it is the government regulations that prevent a large number of people being brought over. The only people we can bring over are the people who are related, who are nominated by people over here.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I think you are doing quite a praiseworthy work, but I think the impression of the committee is that it is altogether too narrow; and what we are interested in is in enlarging that basis treatise; and if you would say to-morrow, or if the Canadian government would say to-morrow: we will take to Canada the Mennonites who are among the displaced persons, say in the British zone in Germany, the Mennonites would find a way to get them here and you would not be bothered with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Here is the most recent regulation. It is P.C. 371, Privy Council, Canada, at the Government House at Ottawa, Thursday, the 30th day of January, 1947; and it says:

- (c) A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.
- (d) A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

And we all know how hard it is to comply with those regulations.

Mr. COLLEY: I am not here to try to defend the immigration problem. I am in a very awkward position. Possibly if I should read what I have here, it will give you an idea as to what my position is, and tell you what the Intergovernmental Committee is.

Honourable Senators,—The members of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees are Governments which have accepted membership thereof for the purpose of participating in the humanitarian work for which the Committee has been created, and as such, it is an international body. I am the Resident Representative in Canada of that Committee.

I am an exclusively international official. On taking over my duties I had to make the following declaration:

"I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience the functions entrusted to me as an employee of the Committee, to discharge the functions entrusted to me and regulate my conduct with its interests alone in view, and not to seek or receive from any government or other authority external to the Committee any instructions in the performance of my official duties."

The reason for the appointment of a Resident Representative in Canada is the situation in Europe brought about by the so called displaced persons in Germany. Something had to be attempted to solve this problem pending the establishment of the International Refugee Organization as a specialized agency of the United Nations for the purpose. So far as the situation in Germany, Austria and Italy is concerned, it may be briefly explained that hitherto the main emphasis has been on repatriation and this is still regarded as an extremely important objective. To an increasing extent during the last year or more, however, it has become obvious that the original impetus towards repatriation has diminished, and that while to a reduced extent repatriation may continue, there is now apparent a hard core of persons who, for one reason or another, are at present firmly determined not to return to their countries of nationality. The existence of this hard core has for some time been, and still is, a cause of grave anxiety to the Military Governments and to UNRRA, both because of the political, economic and administrative difficulties that result therefrom, and also because of the steady deterioration that is taking place among the displaced persons themselves. The conviction has therefore grown that at least initial steps should be taken towards a solution of the problem of non-repatriables. This conviction was strengthened by the course of discussions last year in connection with the establishment of the International Refugee Organization. While emphasis has rightly been placed on voluntary repatriation as the most satisfactory remedy of all, it has been recognized that this should be accompanied by other measures relating to those who are unable or unwilling to return. Although pending the establishment of the International Refugee Organization, there was opposition from some Governments to interim measures other than repatriation being undertaken, there was, on the other hand, strong opinion among many Governments that further delay would be harmful. A relevant consideration and an important one, was that apart from the actual achievements during the interim period, a great deal of preliminary and preparatory work might be done which would be of great use to the new Organization.



It was in support of such interim measures that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America put forward proposals relating to the extension of current activities of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. The effects of those proposals, as sanctioned by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 16th July, 1946, are as follows:

- (1) Current programs of relief in various countries relating to the classes a, b and c in the notes I read this morning remain unchanged. They will continue as before.
- (2) The activities of the Committee are now extended to other classes which are within the mandate, and in particular to those displaced persons and refugees who are unwilling or unable to return to their countries of nationality or former habitual residence.
- (3) In regard to such persons, however, the Committee has agreed to observe the principles contained in Annex 1 (Definitions) to the Draft Constitution for the International Refugee Organization, as approved by the Social and Economic Council. The preamble to the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization reads as follows:

The Governments accepting this Constitution,  
RECOGNIZING:

that genuine refugees and displaced persons constitute an urgent problem which is international in scope and character;

that as regards displaced persons, the main task to be performed is to encourage and assist in every way possible their early return to their country of origin;

that genuine refugees and displaced persons should be assisted by international action, either to return to their countries of nationality or former habitual residence, or to find new homes elsewhere, under the conditions provided for in this Constitution; or in the case of Spanish Republicans, to establish themselves temporarily in order to enable them to return to Spain when the present Falangist regime is succeeded by a democratic regime;

that resettlement and re-establishment of refugees and displaced persons be contemplated only in cases indicated clearly in the Constitution;

that genuine refugees and displaced persons, until such time as their repatriation or resettlement and re-establishment is effectively completed, should be protected in their rights and legitimate interests, should receive care and assistance and, as far as possible, should be put to useful employment in order to avoid the evil and anti-social consequences of continued idleness;

that the expenses of repatriation to the extent practicable should be charged to Germany and Japan for persons displaced by those Powers from countries occupied by them:

HAVE AGREED:

for the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes in the shortest possible time, to establish and do hereby establish a non-permanent organization to be called the International Refugee Organization.

Then follow several articles which the member governments have accepted, including a mandate, functions and powers, relationship to the United Nations, membership and so on, and also Annex 1. to which I have referred and which is governing the present operations of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

Among the functions of the IRO which the IGCR is doing preliminary work are facilitating the emigration to, resettlement and re-establishment in other countries of individuals and family units; and as may be necessary and

practicable, within available resources and subject to relevant financial regulations the investigation, promotion or execution of projects of group resettlement or large-scale settlement.

The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has, at present, a large, able and efficient staff engaged in seeking opportunities for the resettlement in, and the migration to, other lands of as many as possible of the displaced persons who do not desire to return to their homelands. Most of these people are living in camps, barracks and other concentrations which are scattered throughout Germany, Austria and Italy.

Since my appointment it has been my endeavour to "sell" so to speak, these displaced persons to Canada; and within the present immigration regulations and considering the shortage of shipping, we have not done so badly so far, though what we have accomplished is as just a drop in the ocean, compared with the needs of each party. I mentioned this morning the possibilities of settlement arising from the placing of families in the sugar beet growing areas for work in the sugar beet fields. I consider this comes under the category of a large scale settlement project. Immediate settlement on land of people coming directly from Europe is a costly proposition which I do not think any organization would be warranted in undertaking nowadays. But by being enabled to take work in the beet fields, families could earn sufficient money to capitalize their start; at the same time, they could be getting acquainted with the customs and habits of the country, and with the language.

In about two years time, Canada will need settlers to occupy the 300,000 acres of land now being brought under irrigation in South Alberta. The time to get them is now. Efforts to bring in settlers with capital in sufficient numbers for the large irrigable areas have failed and will continue to fail. The development of irrigated areas in Alberta and Saskatchewan only began when a sugar factory was established at Raymond, Alberta, in 1925, and when European families were introduced to do the work in the beet fields. As a result, this part of Canada remained comparatively prosperous throughout the depression of the early 1930's. The full development of these areas, for which the right kind of people can be obtained from among the displaced persons, would do more to put Canada on a solid footing and connect east and west securely than any other undertaking in Canada. The areas are capable easily of supporting two million people in diversified farming and related industries and the benefit of a settlement of this kind would be felt in all the surrounding country.

There are many other projects for which the displaced persons are fitted: logging, mining, farm workers, female household and hospital workers, to mention only a few.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the operations of the IGCR in Europe. We locate and assemble the people for immigration inspection. Each prospective immigrant is given an X-ray and Wassermann test and his record is carefully examined beforehand. After the immigrants have passed the medical and immigration examinations and visas are granted, transportation is arranged for them and they are brought to Canada under the conductorship of an officer of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted.

OTTAWA, 24th April, 1947.

I have dealt with the practical issue of trying to get these people over here and to get them settled when they are here. I believe the displaced person is a problem in itself and should be considered as separate from the immigration problem; but nobody has told the Immigration Department to treat it as a separate problem; but if it could be treated as a separate problem, as it should be,

upon humanitarian grounds, and there are good practical reasons, economic and beneficial to Canada, as a whole, I think we would go a long way towards accomplishing something.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: And until that is done, there is really, I take it, no other way.

Mr. COLLEY: I am under the impression, but it may come too late, that they have under consideration the movement of a number of people in bulk.

The CHAIRMAN: Here are a lot of figures that Mr. MacKay presented to us, and I noted on it; make an intelligent condensation of this document to be included in the record, if that can be done. Is that agreeable to you?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I think it should be printed as an appendix to this report.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Colley, for coming around and giving us this additional information this afternoon. Now, I presume we will be doing what?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will meet again next Wednesday at 10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well then, the Committee now stands adjourned until next Wednesday, April 30, at 10.30 a.m.

The Committee adjourned at 5.35 p.m. to meet again on Wednesday, April 30, at 10.30 a.m.



## APPENDIX "A"

TABLE "A" (PART 1)  
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF D.P. SKILLS\*

A Administrative— Clerical and Commercial	B Mining— Chemicals and Processing	C Construction and Maintenance	D Agriculture—Forestry Dairy and Food Processing	E Health and Sanitation
1. Accountant: auditor, book-keeper. 2. Businessman: manager, executive. 3. Clerk: general, file postal. 4. Salesman: person, clerk. 5. Office Machine Operator. 6. Office Manager. 7. Stenographer. 8. Translator: interpreter. 9. Typist.	1. Ceramic Worker. 2. Glass Worker: blower. 3. Miner: hand, power. 4. Petroleum Worker. 5. Steel Puddler: furnace man. 6. Quarryman: stone cutter.	1. Architect. 2. Bricklayer. 3. Carpenter. 4. Construction Machine Operator. 5. Central Heat Maintenance man: installer, repair man. 6. Dredgeman. 7. Draftsman. 8. Electrician. 9. Engineman: operating. 10. Glazier. 11. Mason. 12. Powderman: blaster. 13. Painter: interior, exterior, sign, spray. 14. Plumber: steam fitter. 15. Rigger. 16. Riveter. 17. Saw Mill Operator. 18. Steelworker. 19. Surveyor.	1. Farmer: dairymen, produce, egg, chicken, animal. 2. Lumberman. 3. Hunter: trapper, fisherman. 4. Miller: grain.	1. Dentist: technician, mechanic. 2. Dietician. 3. Hospital Attendant: ward boy. 4. Midwife. 5. Nurse: registered; practical training. 6. Optometrist. 7. Ophthalmologist. 8. Pediatrician. 9. Physical Therapist. 10. Physician: surgeon. 11. Pharmacist. 12. Sanitary Engineer: technician. 13. Veterinarian. 14. X-Ray Technician.

\*NOTE.—Labourer, apprentice, helper will be coded with the applicable group from above.

APPENDIX "A"—*Con.*

TABLE "A" (PART II)

OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF D.P. SKILLS\*

F	G	H	J	K
Communications, Transportation and Supply	Special Services	Professional and Arts (Other than Health and Sanitation)	Metal Trades	Miscellaneous Processing
1. Airplane Mechanic. 2. Airplane Pilot. 3. Auto and Truck Mechanic. 4. Auto and Truck Body Repairman. 5. Driver: light, heavy truck. 6. Crater or Packer. 7. Installer, repairman: telephone, telegraph. 8. Lineman. 9. Radio Operator. 10. Radio Repairman. 11. Railway Worker: locomotive engineer, locomotive mechanic, switchman, brakeman, conductor. 12. Seaman. 13. Teamster. 14. Telegraph Operator. 15. Telephone Operator. 16. Teletype Operator, Repairman. 17. Tire Rebuilder. 18. Warehouseman.	1. Baker. 2. Barber: friseur, hairdresser. 3. Blacksmith. 4. Bookbinder. 5. Butcher. 6. Cook. 7. Firefighter. 8. Gardener. 9. Housekeeper, domestic. 10. Jeweller. 11. Kitchen Worker. 12. Laundryman: machine, hand. 13. Linotype Operator. 14. Locksmith. 15. Optician. 16. Photographer. 17. Piano Tuner. 18. Policeman or Guard. 19. Pressman. 20. Printer. 21. Projectionist. 22. Shoemaker: repairman, saddler, harness maker. 23. Tailor or Seamstress. 24. Undertaker. 25. Upholsterer. 26. Waiter. 27. Watch Repairman.	1. Agronomist. 2. Artist: sculptor. 3. Athletic Instructor. 4. Clergyman. 5. Chemist. 6. Child Care Worker. 7. Engineer: Civil. 8. Engineer: Electrical. 9. Engineer: Industrial. 10. Engineer: Mechanical. 11. Engineer: Mining, etc. 12. Entertainer: actor, singer, dancer. 13. Lawyer. 14. Librarian. 15. Musician. 16. Recreation Leader. 17. Social Worker. 18. Teacher, Professor, academic. 19. Teacher: arts and crafts. 20. Teacher, professor, technical. 21. Occupational Interviewer: counsellor. 22. Writer: reporter, author, advertising man.	1. Electroplater. 2. Foundryman. 3. Forgemán. 4. Heat Treater. 5. Machine Operator. 6. Machinist. 7. Millwright. 8. Welder: spot, finish, gas, electric. 10. Toolmaker.	1. Clothing Worker, machine. 2. Cooper. 3. Leather Worker. 4. Paper Worker. 5. Rubber Worker. 6. Steel Puddler or Furnaceman. 7. Textile Worker. 8. Woodworker.

\* NOTE.—Labourer, apprentice, helper will be coded with the applicable group above.

APPENDIX "A"—*Con.*

## D.P. LABOUR REPORT (HANNOVER REGION)

Skills by occupat. serial code	Poles		Latvians		Lithuanians		Estonians		Yugo-Slavs		Jews		Ukrainians		Others		Total	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
A. 1.....	80	46	215	121	123	21	50	54	5	1	68	61	85	33	33	10	659	347
A. 2.....	104	33	260	64	115	14	90	25	12	2	150	9	35	1	15	1	766	149
A. 3.....	299	181	260	281	254	92	55	199	16	12	53	65	30	42	29	22	1,001	894
A. 4.....	267	220	92	90	55	70	22	59	25	9	12	27	72	10	14	8	559	493
A. 5.....	60	70	4	4	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	5	3	2	1	62	82
A. 6.....	23	39	82	21	21	5	20	6	2	2	2	11	5	2	2	1	157	67
A. 7.....	6	14	2	11	3	6	3	9	3	3	7	6	2	5	5	4	8	62
A. 8.....	5	22	10	19	3	6	3	10	2	2	16	44	2	2	4	4	35	71
A. 9.....	11	33	4	60	3	28	14	4	2	4	16	3	35	14	15	2	40	212
A. 0.....	197	108	48	19	17	1	39	51	7	10	2	2	35	41	8	2	351	232
B. 1.....	19	7	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	31	8
B. 2.....	43	14	3	2	4	1	1	4	11	4	4	1	1	1	3	1	56	15
B. 3.....	122	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	23	2	2	2	161	2
B. 4.....	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	4	1	8	1	1	2	24	2
B. 5.....	22	16	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	25	16
B. 6.....	40	15	11	2	6	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	9	3	5	2	56	3
B. 0.....	75	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	10	3	5	1	106	19
C. 1.....	16	2	32	8	8	1	4	4	1	1	7	7	11	2	2	2	81	2
C. 2.....	205	25	25	25	5	1	1	1	4	4	188	1	39	3	3	3	232	8
C. 3.....	352	2	159	3	57	2	19	2	10	2	5	5	161	22	22	1	968	1
C. 4.....	25	2	3	2	4	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	21	2	2	2	57	4
C. 5.....	31	2	8	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	9	2	2	1	55	4
C. 6.....	3	3	2	2	4	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	2
C. 7.....	30	5	30	3	3	1	10	6	2	2	4	3	19	9	2	3	100	30
C. 8.....	174	4	156	22	43	2	21	14	12	4	104	4	119	2	20	3	649	10
C. 9.....	22	2	22	2	3	2	11	2	3	3	28	7	7	2	2	2	73	2
C. 10.....	7	2	3	3	4	2	3	3	16	3	16	16	49	1	1	1	50	3
C. 11.....	120	1	35	1	21	2	7	2	14	14	63	3	30	6	6	1	238	3
C. 12.....	12	1	1	1	13	1	7	35	2	2	35	3	7	4	1	1	296	1
C. 13.....	113	3	50	4	35	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	6	78	25	25	78	1
C. 14.....	32	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	6	1	1	1	25	1
C. 15.....	17	6	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	13	1
C. 16.....	6	6	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	13	1





G. 1.	269	15	63	2	27	7	2	25	1	103	7	84	10	14	4	592	41
G. 2.	152	45	23	38	16	3	17	12	4	91	28	42	3	6	...	321	144
G. 3.	155	3	32	5	39	1	...	1	...	8	...	67	...	7	...	42	3
G. 4.	13	5	5	5	4	1	...	...	...	15	...	2	1	1	...	671	13
G. 5.	364	4	50	1	38	2	...	19	...	93	...	89	3	16	1	...	13
G. 6.	81	253	19	31	8	7	23	2	19	11	23	45	35	7	14	180	416
G. 7.	8	1	14	2	6	1	...	...	...	1	...	12	...	...	...	42	3
G. 8.	214	49	65	21	22	6	2	9	...	12	11	38	6	3	...	369	92
G. 9.	76	1,919	2	688	1	1	215	...	320	1	138	6	515	...	336	87	4,628
G. 10.	15	10	7	...	1	...	...	...	...	14	...	1	...	1	...	40	11
G. 11.	62	292	2	17	8	...	4	...	5	1	5	4	88	1	20	78	445
G. 12.	16	52	...	5	...	1	5	...	...	2	3	3	11	1	...	23	83
G. 13.	3	...	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	1	9	3
G. 14.	809	2	113	...	58	35	...	39	...	180	...	223	...	32	1	1,489	3
G. 15.	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	2	...	15	5	14	1	9	2	84	20
G. 16.	20	2	16	8	6	2	...	...	...	...	...	4	1	...	...	4	...
G. 17.	3	...	...	...	66	31	...	11	1	1	...	4	1	...	...	272	9
G. 18.	99	...	60	...	5	1	...	1	1	22	3	6	4	1	...	28	5
G. 19.	10	4	8	...	5	6	1	...	...	...	...	6	4	4	3	76	20
G. 20.	18	7	14	2	2	1	...	...	...	2	...	2	...	...	...	30	...
G. 21.	14	...	9	...	99	18	6	35	...	300	7	358	1	39	2	1,658	34
G. 22.	723	11	86	5	2	1	67	19	55	1,073	551	140	108	26	40	1,645	2,339
G. 23.	220	1,168	69	112	80	18	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	10	1
G. 24.	8	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	42	6
G. 25.	21	2	4	...	2	2	4	1	...	9	...	1	...	2	...	108	200
G. 26.	55	126	10	8	3	1	27	2	2	47	3	6	24	4	6	122	...
G. 27.	41	...	8	...	6	2	56	22	2	83	233	14	...	2	...	1,085	967
G. 0.	725	509	80	77	56	31	...	...	...	...	...	77	57	11	7	...	...
H. 1.	41	7	62	11	33	13	5	2	...	2	...	48	1	10	...	211	26
H. 2.	19	9	40	9	9	6	2	4	...	10	1	27	1	9	5	124	32
H. 3.	8	1	7	6	2	9	2	...	...	31	...	7	...	4	...	68	9
H. 4.	18	2	17	1	17	13	...	...	...	140	...	30	6	6	2	241	5
H. 5.	24	7	31	8	4	7	...	2	2	12	2	13	7	5	3	98	33
H. 6.	9	27	6	14	3	...	5	...	2	...	2	1	12	...	2	19	77
H. 7.	26	1	75	...	29	16	...	2	1	4	...	17	...	18	1	187	5
H. 8.	25	3	36	...	9	11	1	1	1	3	...	20	2	11	1	116	7
H. 9.	10	1	15	1	6	7	...	1	...	5	1	10	1	16	...	59	2
H. 10.	29	1	42	2	21	5	...	...	...	...	...	29	1	...	...	148	5
H. 11.	16	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8	...	...	...	34	...
H. 12.	14	12	40	38	4	14	1	3	1	8	2	45	38	6	17	146	131
H. 13.	25	2	51	10	34	31	1	...	...	11	5	13	...	6	...	171	20
H. 14.	9	5	1	4	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	...	13	10
H. 15.	34	12	42	11	13	5	6	8	...	7	7	1	10	13	4	147	51
H. 16.	9	4	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	25	...	...	...	10	4
H. 17.	14	22	85	2	1	3	...	...	...	...	44	1	2	1	...	24	27
H. 18.	94	134	...	93	73	18	33	2	4	17	...	60	58	22	11	370	450
H. 19.	15	24	26	36	27	13	18	...	1	1	8	34	13	22	19	136	146

APPENDIX "A"—*Con.*D.P. LABOUR REPORT (HANNOVER REGION) —*Continued*

Skills by occupat. serial code	Poles		Latvians		Lithuanians		Estonians		Yugo-Slavs		Jews		Ukrainians		Others		Total	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
H. 20.....	5	2	21	8	2	3	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	11	.....	2	2	44	17
H. 21.....	3	1	1	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	2	.....	1	.....	9	1
H. 22.....	3	3	20	4	8	2	10	2	1	.....	4	.....	16	.....	8	1	70	12
H. 0.....	112	79	214	140	83	23	81	37	23	4	4	2	34	15	37	9	588	309
J. 1.....	8	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	10	3
J. 2.....	53	4	4	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	3	.....	1	.....	68	4
J. 3.....	36	.....	10	.....	18	.....	1	.....	7	.....	2	.....	30	.....	1	.....	104	.....
J. 4.....	24	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	25	.....
J. 5.....	124	31	57	1	17	.....	9	.....	32	2	.....	.....	76	.....	5	1	320	35
J. 6.....	123	80	41	1	10	.....	4	.....	26	.....	48	.....	41	1	3	1	296	83
J. 7.....	78	6	5	.....	7	.....	2	1	.....	.....	28	.....	65	.....	.....	.....	187	7
J. 8.....	14	.....	4	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	12	.....	1	.....	33	.....
J. 9.....	117	12	18	1	4	.....	4	.....	7	.....	3	2	38	1	8	.....	199	16
J. 10.....	30	3	16	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	10	.....	3	.....	64	4
J. 0.....	106	46	39	2	10	.....	6	.....	7	1	4	20	43	9	13	5	228	83
K. 1.....	17	15	1	.....	2	5	.....	5	1	3	66	62	4	8	3	3	94	101
K. 2.....	11	2	2	.....	1	.....	2	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	5	.....	1	.....	25	2
K. 3.....	34	10	7	.....	5	2	1	1	.....	.....	41	6	10	.....	1	1	100	21
K. 4.....	15	13	1	2	1	.....	4	.....	.....	1	4	2	13	2	1	.....	39	20
K. 5.....	20	18	1	.....	6	2	1	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	3	1	.....	1	32	22
K. 6.....	52	8	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	6	1	.....	.....	60	10
K. 7.....	191	200	24	27	22	27	5	24	21	9	107	69	24	18	2	2	396	376
K. 8.....	443	21	95	.....	70	.....	10	.....	25	1	49	5	207	1	19	.....	918	28
K. 0.....	765	886	28	42	43	14	9	10	2	1	9	29	81	32	21	11	958	1,025
Without Code.....	27	60	157	71	67	45	108	55	.....	.....	1,369	2,050	28	14	1	1	1,757	2,296

30th September, 1946.  
400 UNRRA Zone H.Q.,  
B.A.O.R.



Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada, Immigration and Labour  
Grandeur Office, 1947

(1947)

# (THE SENATE OF CANADA)



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

## Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 4

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

Mr. R. N. Bryson, Toronto, Ontario, President of the Community Welfare Association of Ontario.

Mr. Elmar V. Spielberg, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Latvian Relief Fund of Canada and Chairman, Federation of Baltic Canadians.

### APPENDIX

A. Brief by Mr. T. J. Keenan, Meadowbank Ranch, Lac La Hache, British Columbia, on Displaced Persons in Europe.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947





## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, 30th April, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Burchill, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor and Wilson—8.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Chairman filed a list of immigrants admitted to Canada during the year 1946, by nationalities, received from Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources.

The Honourable Senator Roebuck filed a brief by Mr. T. J. Keenan, Meadowbank Ranch, Lac La Hache, British Columbia, on Displaced Persons in Europe, which was ordered to be printed in the record of this day. (See Appendix "A".)

Mr. R. N. Bryson, Toronto, Ontario, President of the Community Welfare Association of Ontario, was heard, and read a brief on Latvian Immigration, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Elmar V. Spielberg, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Latvian Relief Fund of Canada and Chairman, Federation of Baltic Canadians, was heard with respect to Baltic peoples.

The Honourable Senator Wilson read copy of a letter directed to the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, by Executive Secretary, Canadian Association of Social Workers, with respect to Displaced Persons of Europe.

At 11.30 a.m., the Committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 1st May, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

## THE SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable members, it will be recalled that a week ago today we had before us Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of the Immigration Branch, and that we asked him to furnish certain information. He has written me as follows:

## DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

### IMMIGRATION BRANCH

OTTAWA, 24th April, 1947.

DEAR SENATOR MURDOCK,—When giving evidence yesterday before your Committee on Immigration and Labour, I was asked to furnish some Immigration figures for the calendar year 1946. I now enclose in duplicate two statements, one covering total immigration to Canada by nationalities and the other covering immigration to Canada, classified according to country of last permanent residence.

You also requested particulars of dependents of members of the Canadian Armed Forces admitted to Canada during the calendar year 1946. A statement covering this movement is also transmitted with this letter.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) A. L. JOLLIFFE,  
*Director.*

Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C.,  
Chairman of the Standing Committee on  
Immigration and Labour,  
The Senate,  
Ottawa.

## TOTAL IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, BY NATIONALITIES, FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1946.

Austrian .....	25
Belgian .....	79
British .....	59,511
Bulgarian .....	2
Central American .....	7
Czecho-Slovakian .....	216
Danish .....	36
Danzig .....	2
Dutch .....	178
Estonian .....	3
Finnish .....	7
French .....	101
German .....	844
Greek .....	37



TOTAL IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, BY NATIONALITIES, FOR THE CALENDAR  
YEAR 1946—*Con.*

Hungarian .....	61
Italian .....	35
Jugo-Slavian .....	22
Latvian .....	2
Lithuanian .....	2
Luxemburg .....	2
Mexican .....	6
Norwegian .....	183
Polish .....	627
Portuguese .....	4
Roumanian .....	28
Russian .....	23
South American .....	16
Spanish .....	6
Swedish .....	12
Swiss .....	13
Syrian .....	2
Ukrainian .....	1
U. S. A. Citizens .....	9,623
West Indian (Not British) .....	3
Total .....	71,719

DEPENDENTS OF CANADIAN ARMED FORCES ADMITTED DURING THE  
CALENDAR YEAR 1946

Wives .....	31,807
Children .....	14,272
Total .....	46,079

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Over the eight o'clock news broadcast yesterday there was an announcement by the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario that 500 farm workers were coming here from the Netherlands. I do not know whether any other member of the committee heard that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I did not hear it.

Mr. Chairman, I have a brief supplied to me by Mr. T. J. Keenan, who is now at Meadowbanks Ranch, Lac La Hache, British Columbia. He was a representative of the United Nations, in charge of some camps.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: He was with UNRRA.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, in the UNRRA camps. He is now out in British Columbia and is not able to appear personally, but he has sent in a very fine brief. It is a little too long for me to read at this time, and I therefore propose with your permission to put it on the record.

The CHAIRMAN: All right.

*(See Appendix to this report).*

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we have with us this morning Mr. R. N. Bryson, President of the Community Welfare Association of Ontario, who as such has been brought into touch with the Baltic peoples in a way that he will describe to us—that is, the peoples of the three nations which, as you know, had been independent since the last war but are now controlled by the Soviet Union. Mr. Bryson is also President of the Boy Scouts of Toronto.

Mr. Elmer Spielberg, Secretary of the Latvian Relief Fund of Canada and Chairman of the Federation of Baltic Canadians, is also here.

He may have just a word to say, but Mr. Bryson is the spokesman of the delegation. If we are ready to hear Mr. Bryson I shall call on him now.

Mr. R. N. BRYSON: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, that I may have the honour of appearing before you today is greatly appreciated; that I

may receive a hearing as a private citizen before this august body is a democratic act which holds much significance. For there are those today who have no voice in their own affairs, nor of the affairs of their country. They are people without a country; they are Displaced Persons.

Actually, I am wrong when I say that they have no voice in their own affairs. They have. For political reasons, they have rejected the chance to return to their own countries, and have asked to be sent to Canada. For these, I speak.

Honourable Senators, I speak as a Canadian who for many years has had close association with the people of the Latvian communities in Canada. They are a fine people. Out of 800,000 Displaced Persons now in Germany, 100,000 people from the countries of the Baltic—Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania—have put down Canada as their desired destination.

Latvians are a people who many times have had to fight Swedes, Poles, Germans and Russians, and it was only in 1918 that they gained their independence. They object to "isms" and are intolerant of communist domination. After 22 years of independence, their country was taken over by Soviet Russia in 1940. They love their country, but now, rather than go back within the iron curtain, they are begging for the opportunity to live in Canada in peace and security. Some have actually sent word they would willingly endure life in this country in jail for a chance to eventually live in freedom.

During the time I have been interested in the Latvians, I have noted some confusion in the minds of Canadians as to the country and race. Situated directly across the Baltic Sea from Sweden, the country of Latvia is in the same latitude as Northern England and Scotland. Latvians themselves are a race apart.

They are not Russians, nor do they bear traces of any Slavic blood. They are not Germans, nor "emancipated" Poles. They do bear some resemblance to the Nordic peoples, with their blue eyes and fair complexions. Their speech, however, is completely their own and is derived from ancient Sanskrit.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are they the same as the Finns, to some extent?

Mr. BRYSON: Yes, they are, but they are a tribe of their own.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They came up from the south.

Mr. BRYSON: That is right.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And were probably rolled up ahead of the Tartars?

Mr. BRYSON: That is exactly the story—3,000 years before Christ, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The Finns are very much the same.

Mr. BRYSON: Very much the same. The Lithuanians are the same, a segment broke off many years ago. I am trying to emphasize that point, because I think it very important.

Being one of the Indo-European nations, Latvians are among the most easily assimilated of any European race. Because of this, they do not tend to form settlements, nor perpetuate any particular customs or modes of life. An important factor is their ability to learn English quickly, since the average Latvian is a good linguist. Second-generation Latvian-Canadians have demonstrated that they can become indistinguishable from citizens of British or French stock.

As a people, they are naturally democratic, all their leading men and intellectuals have been direct descendants of farmers. Because of the absence of natural riches in their country, Latvians have had to be diligent, thrifty and skillful. While they have displayed great tolerance and receptiveness to cultural influence during the free years of their country since 1918, history

reveals they put up a strong resistance, to the imperialistic onslaughts of the Germans from the West and the Muscovites and Tartars from the East in those early days of aggression.

Latvians differ from their eastern neighbours, the Slavs, by their love of personal freedom and high standards of life; by their principle of private property, and by their Protestant and Roman Catholic faiths. They believe in political equality, self-government, and in the family as a basis of national unity, not as a cell of the political party.

Seventy per cent of Latvia's population before the second World War followed agricultural pursuits, and since 27 per cent of the country is covered with woodlands, the people are also experienced lumbermen. Yet Latvians are not to be considered "peasant" stock, since illiteracy with them is almost an unknown word.

There is in Canada today a crying need for labour. Dr. Allan Peebles, director of research and statistics for the Department of Labour, estimates that in the next two years this country will suffer a labour shortage of between 35,000 and 44,000 men and women. Co-incident with this need is the urgent cry—starting so quietly and gaining such force—for the permission to bring immigrant labour to Canada. I add my voice to this cry.

As I mentioned before, Latvians are primarily agricultural. Their principal exports before the war were butter, eggs, pigs, hides, and timber, pulp, ply-wood, paper, cardboard, and grains. Sixty-nine per cent of the people were occupied with agriculture and fishing while the remaining figures were chiefly concerned with industry and handicraft; trade-transportation and communication; civil service and professions; and domestic and personal services, the latter being only 2 per cent.

Farming is a highly productive enterprise in Latvia, the people taking great pride in possession. The farms are mostly privately-owned, and it is interesting to note that of the 70 per cent of the population operating farms, 35.8 held land up to 25 acres in size, 32.7 per cent had farms ranging between 25 to 50 acres, 14.9 between 50 and 75 acres, and 10.2 between 75 and 150 acres. The remaining 6.4 are in the "big-time" class with farms up to 250 acres and over.

Their crops consisted of the principal grains grown in Canada—rye, barley, oats and flax—with potatoes and sugar beets. The latter, sugar beets, is a very large item in Latvia and should be an important factor to us. Sugar production here is a growing industry, and not long ago, members of the Sugar Beet Growers' Association of Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario came to Ottawa with a request for 3,000 immigrants to settle on the beet farms of Canada.

Such an influx would create a 30,000-acre increase in beet sugar production, and the people could be housed in accommodation used during the war by Japanese-Canadians. In one area near Chatham, Ontario, a sugar beet refinery is offering farmers loans with which to build houses.

Last winter, the Right Hon. James Gardiner, Dominion Minister of Agriculture, made the statement that Canada needs another ten or twelve million inhabitants; now, the Hon. T. L. Kennedy, Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, has announced that Ontario needs another 5,000 farm hands to ease the labour shortage, and only sufficient labour will bring down the high cost of food. Mr. Kennedy further announced he had received permission for the labour immigration into Ontario of 500 Netherlands, but also admitted that such a figure would not go far in easing the terrific work shortage.

Consider the recommendation of T. J. Keenan, director of UNRAA assembly centres in Northern Germany and recently named an official witness before this very senate committee: "I know my Canada," he has stated, "and I know my Europe. There are in Germany today, from Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, 100,000 Baltic people (out of a total of 800,000 displaced persons), who have put



down Canada as their desired destination. They look on Canada as a country like themselves; one of the smaller democratic nations with an independent and cultural tradition. They would make the very finest citizens."

Professor Watson Kirkconnell, of McMaster University, has this to say: "Among the homeless refugees and dispossessed persons of Europe—Ukrainians, Poles, Balts and Serbs—are a great majority who are honest, devout, hard-working and freedom-loving. They know the horrors of dictatorship at first hand, and would by their testimony and love of liberty help incalculably to save this country from the Communist conspiracy. By admitting a generous share of these people, we can safeguard Canada's foundations for the years that lie ahead."

This is not the first time a Canadian citizen has urged upon you the lifting of our immigration laws to permit entrance of displaced Latvians into the country.

On July 31 of last year, Mr. W. Van Ark, assistant chief transport officer in the United States UNRAA Zone, said in this very chamber:

"I presume that you gentlemen are well aware of the high education standards which prevail in the above-mentioned (Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania) countries, now occupied by, and included in, the USSR.

"They are experts in dairy farming, and firm believers in co-operative efforts." Speaking as an officer for UNRAA, Mr. Van Ark continued:

"This became at once apparent in the displaced persons assembly centres, when they assisted to organize the many services in their behalf, and worked out extremely well their whole educational system.

"They are pleasant, well-mannered, law-abiding, intelligent and most willing workers—very democratic in their outlook; neat, with an inventive turn of mind."

Honourable senators, may I, with Mr. Van Ark, suggest that displaced persons from Latvia would be an asset to our country; would help us enrich a land whose resources are grossly undeveloped; and would fill our great need of increased population. They want to come here, and since their way of life is like our own, they would be most desirable citizens.

In conclusion let me stress, time is running out, there must be action now, let us help them and in so doing so help ourselves.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Bryson.

Hon. Mr. MALLOY: Do you prefer the people from Latvia to those from Estonia and Lithuania?

Mr. BRYSON: No. I happen to be personally acquainted with the Latvian group, but I also know the Lithuanian and Estonian groups. To my mind they are all the same; I speak for all, for the whole Baltic group. They are high class people and I think they would make a valuable contribution to the Canadian way of life.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In matters of religion they are pretty well mixed up. There are all sorts of religions represented among them?

Mr. BRYSON: That is a happy circumstance for this country. They are Christian nations; they are pretty well-balanced between those of the Roman Catholic faith and those of the Protestant faith. So it is a pretty happy balance that we have there. There is no question that they would fit in very nicely with our northern climate. Their climate is similar to ours and they produce much the same products.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: These little nations have been able to live side by side without cutting each others' throats?

Mr. BRYSON: They have never had any trouble between them.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is a very good indication.

Mr. BRYSON: And they are in a very difficult spot.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Mr. Mowat, of the Palestine Committee, mentioned a point which is rather interesting. There were a good many Finns working in the northern country, building, I think, the Alaska highway.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is so.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: And these men said they would be only too happy to settle in that part of the country. It was land which Canadians would never think of cultivating; but they felt that they could make a living there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: On the Alaska highway.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Well, it contains a good deal of muskeg, and there were other things about it which made it, they say, similar to their own country.

Mr. BRYSON: It is very similar. The latitude also corresponds.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: You say that 100,000 of them have expressed a desire to come to Canada?

Mr. BRYSON: That is right.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: They are not all together, are they? They are scattered?

Mr. BRYSON: They are in various "camps", both in the American and the British zones. They are scattered in "camps", as they call them. Here is an interesting feature. For almost two years these people have been kicking themselves around, they have been idle—it is really a crying shame—but yet they have been busy; they have a university of 2,500 at Hamburg. As I think Mr. Van Ark pointed out, they have organized an educational system; and men with degrees like Ph.D. are learning trades, assuming that there will be a demand for that kind of thing in Canada: they are learning trades—anything rather than go back to the other political centre.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I know that the women of that group, despite their agricultural background, are very well educated. There are doctors and nurses among them, and those who have been taken into the British hospitals are doing particularly good service. I believe that trained nurses are serving as ward maids, and things like that.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: You say that the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Ontario explained that he had obtained permission to bring in 500 agricultural workers. I take it that he is bringing in Netherlanders.

Mr. BRYSON: That was just a news item which I saw in the newspaper yesterday?

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Why should he bring them in preference to these displaced people?

Mr. BRYSON: Probably it is much easier to bring them from one country to another than it is to bring them from the displaced persons centres. It seems hard to break up the displaced persons problem, whereas you can deal directly with a civil power like the Netherlands and get action. I think that is the only reason why.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That seems unfortunate.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It seems most unfortunate.

Mr. BRYSON: They are kicked around—idle people. It is a shame.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think it is too bad to bring in 500 men who, if I interpret the statement correctly, are without their families. This has created a problem before, and will do so again.

Mr. BRYSON: I might point out this, that they are great lovers of family life. As a group they are very strong for their faith and for their family life; and I guarantee to this country that it would be very desirable to have some of them.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: They have not any means of their own?

Mr. BRYSON: No, they have no means of their own. As you know, they have been swept from their country. Some of them had beautiful homes, factories and other assets just as we have. These have all gone. They have gone through all this experience more than once. They look to us for leadership today. They feel that under our democracy, and this being a similar type of country to theirs, they can live in freedom. I think it is an opportunity to which we ought to give very serious consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Many of the displaced persons in Germany and Austria are regarded as enemy aliens according to the regulations of the Department of Immigration. Mr. Jolliffe says that this does not come within the mandate, and therefore it is difficult to bring them in, and that is why they would go to the Netherlands or some other country to get a considerable number of working people, where there would be no red tape or delay in getting them sent forward.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: As far as enemy aliens are concerned, are not the great bulk of these people enemy aliens as a result of force, not of choice?

Mr. BRYSON: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: It depends where they were born, according to our immigration policy.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Well, let us change the immigration policy.

The CHAIRMAN: If they were born in Hungary, even if they have been prisoners in Germany for four or five years, they are still of enemy alien origin according to our Immigration Department.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: I say, let us change the regulations of the Immigration Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Would I not like to do that?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is what we are trying to do. Gentlemen, we have here Mr. Spielberg. He is a Latvian born, and has lived in Canada for twenty years, and we can give him five minutes, if that is satisfactory to Mr. Bryson.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, sir: we are much obliged to you.

Mr. BRYSON: Thank you very much for your courtesies, gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And thank you for coming all the way down here and giving us this information.

Mr. BRYSON: I have been very delighted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: It is valuable information for this committee.

Mr. BRYSON: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Now, Mr. Elmar Spielberg, who is Secretary of the Latvian Relief Fund of Canada, and also Chairman of the Federation of Baltic Canadians, so that he is in a position to speak with authority with regard to the Baltic trio.

Mr. ELMAR SPIELBERG, Secretary of the Latvian Relief Fund of Canada; Chairman of the Federation of Baltic Canadians.

The CHAIRMAN: Where is your home? In Toronto?

Mr. SPIELBERG: In Toronto, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: You have lived there for a number of years?

Mr. SPIELBERG: I have lived in Toronto for about four years now, and in Montreal, originally, for about 15 years. I am a metallurgist, something that I started in this country. I went to McGill and to high school here, and have been educated here.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: You were born in Latvia?

Mr. SPIELBERG: I was born in Latvia; Riga, the capital of the country. But mainly I wanted to give you an idea of what a Latvian who has been in this country a little while looks like.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are they all as good looking as you?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Thank you very much. I think they probably are. You will find that the young people who have been born here look exactly like all other Canadians; they do not have any racial characteristics particularly. As you see, I have picked up the language fairly well. Most of them speak good English. When it comes to their settling here and becoming Canadianized, I think you will find they are very good that way.

The CHAIRMAN: What language do you speak at home in Latvia?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Latvian.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it a separate language?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes. The nearest thing to it is Lithuanian.

The CHAIRMAN: How far is it from the Russian language?

Mr. SPIELBERG: It is absolutely different. The Latvian is a mixture of Russian words, German words and words of other nationalities. The English word "bacon" is a Latvian word now, just as the word "gentleman" is, I believe, a French word.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Are the languages of the three countries very different?

Mr. SPIELBERG: The only two that are really related are the Lithuanian and the Latvian. The Estonians and the Finns can understand one another, but the Latvian language is different. It makes it rather awkward for the Latvians, in a way, because if they do go outside of their own country they cannot find anyone who has a language like theirs. One advantage is that inasmuch as Latvia has been occupied by both the Germans and the Russians, most of the people speak the three languages. As a matter of fact, at one time all three were official languages; and since they get American movies there it was rather usual to see half the picture cut off and a translation in the three languages underneath—that made it difficult to see much of the picture.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is my impression right that these three peoples have been able to live together in peace and comparative harmony for a very long time?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is, they are able to be good neighbours?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes. The border between Latvia and Estonia has been particularly free. You may know that in Europe passports and visas are required of people travelling between different countries, but there were not many requirements of that kind between these three countries.

The CHAIRMAN: And they have had democratic governments?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Down through the years?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes. Of course, they have been occupied most of the time. I do not know how they have managed to preserve their group as they have, because they have been under occupation from around the year 1200. The city which I come from was founded in 1201, a pretty old town. It was originally one of the Hanseatic League. As a result they have been under the Poles and



the Swedes and the Russians and the Germans, and back under the Russians and back under the Germans again, so they have not had much opportunity to show the world what they could do as a nation; but they had twenty-five years, roughly, from about 1918 to 1940.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What was the form of government during that time?

Mr. SPIELBERG: A presidency, with a parliament.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: An elected parliament?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: A republic?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes. I believe there were about one hundred representatives.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And they were elected on a territorial basis? I mean, the constituencies were territorial rather than Soviet?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Oh, yes, definitely. A lot of people used to escape over into Latvia from the Soviet; even in the time I was there, in the twenties, they would have airmen coming over in airplanes, going the wrong way on purpose. Russia would demand their return, but Latvia never did return those individuals. The relations have been cordial, but naturally a small country beside a large one has to get along as well as it could.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is the country thickly populated?

Mr. SPIELBERG: I would say it is. Certainly by Canadian standards it is very thickly populated. I believe the population is about two million, and the country itself, if I guess correctly, is somewhere about 200 by 150 miles.

The CHAIRMAN: Russia is in complete domination now?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There is another very serious problem, in that so many people were handed over in the deal that Molotov made with Hitler in 1939 and 1940—I am not sure of the year.

Mr. SPIELBERG: I think it was somewhere about 1939 or 1940.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: A great many people were handed over to Germany at that time?

Mr. SPIELBERG: You mean the sixty thousand or so that were sent over to Germany? They were of German descent.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I thought there were others. I was talking with His Excellency about that and he said there was a quite serious problem there.

Mr. SPIELBERG: I would be inclined to think those would be mostly of German descent. I was in Latvia in 1938 for a visit, and I was back there in 1944 for a visit again, because of my grandparents' golden wedding anniversary, and there were a number of people preparing to leave then. They were of German descent—people working on the German newspapers and so on. There were some advantages to that, one being that the country itself became more Latvian.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: All three countries suffered from the Russians as well as from the Germans?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Oh, yes, absolutely.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: What would be the main occupational groups?

Mr. SPIELBERG: I have the statistics in my pocket, but roughly, I believe that 66·6 per cent are farmers. There are only a few large towns, such as the capital with 400,000 people, and a lot of smaller towns ranging from 50,000 down to 3,000. In these larger towns there are some industries but the occupation is mostly farming.



Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: We know that at the present time these countries are dominated by Russia, but have they any government at all, that is any local government?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Outside the country?

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: No, in the country.

Mr. SPIELBERG: In the country there are definitely governments. I understand that there are governments in all of the countries who speak for the people.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Are those governments chosen by the people or are they appointed by Russia?

Mr. SPIELBERG: That we cannot tell without having been there. I get reports about the elections held. As a matter of fact, some people from the displaced persons camp came to Toronto last week, and they said that they had participated in the elections. They were given closed envelopes and told to go over to the corner behind a screen and put it in the box. That was supposed to be a free election.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Have they the privilege of marking any name on the ballots?

Mr. SPIELBERG: No, no marking to be done at all, as far as I understand from these ladies and gentlemen. Of course the free Latvians, or the people outside the country, feel that Latvia was not properly annexed. My feeling is that if the majority of the country want to join, well and good, as long as it is decided by a free vote. From what I have seen or heard from people I have spoken to, I do not think that there was a free vote. That is all outside the point that there are so many of the people out of the country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are convinced that they would make very good immigrants for Canada?

Mr. SPIELBERG: I do.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know if they are available in considerable numbers?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Will they remain available long?

Mr. SPIELBERG: There is a gradual movement of them towards those countries which have offered them some sanctuary, such as Argentina. Her immigration has been pretty free, a number of them are moving to that country. I believe the Netherlands Government has agreed to take some of them into the mines, but that might not take care of more than probably one-quarter of those available. Of course all of this is guess work on my part, from the figures I have secured from various sources.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: And of course Britain is taking some?

Mr. SPIELBERG: Britain is taking some.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: But they would naturally prefer to come to Canada?

Mr. SPIELBERG: They would.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: These displaced persons, as I understand, were slave labour, were driven out of their country for use in industry in Germany. Is that correct?

Mr. SPIELBERG: No, I would not want to say they are all like that. Some of them were brought into the country as slave labour; the others, I believe, fled on their own accord, to get away from the Russians, because their experience with them in the last war was not very good. There was a lot of killing going on during the last war when Latvia was occupied by both Russians and Germans. Eventually, I do not know how, they managed to throw the Russians out

with the help of the Germans, and then threw the Germans out; that is how they got their independence. Probably a considerable portion of them did come into the country as slave labour.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That has been a very informative talk you have given us, Mr. Spielberg.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you.

Mr. SPIELBERG: Thank you, gentlemen. I hope you will be able to do something about it.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: May I read a letter from the Executive Secretary of the Canadian Association of Social Workers addressed to the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King? It reads as follows:

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

April 11, 1947.

The Right Honourable W. L. MACKENZIE KING,  
Prime Minister of Canada,  
Ottawa.

HONOURABLE SIR,—Some months ago our Association, by letter to you, recorded our conviction that Canada should open its doors to groups of displaced persons from Europe.

The fact that certain regulations have been liberalized is fully appreciated, nevertheless, we wish to draw your attention to the fact that we hear from our own members, who are serving as welfare officers in displaced persons camps, of the awful plight of thousands of persons. Some twenty-five Canadian social workers have been serving with UNRRA for the past two years in Germany, Austria, Italy, and Greece. They have intimate knowledge of these displaced persons, as well as of Canada, and all of them tell us that the Baltic peoples particularly would adjust well to the Canadian pattern of life. Among the displaced persons are skilled workers and professional people, as well as farmers, lumbermen and laborers. We would therefore urge that consideration be given to the admission to Canada of groups other than those presently admitted. We would further urge that Canadian personnel now in Europe, including social workers, be invited to assist in the selection process of immigrants for Canada.

While we realize that immigration policy must be considered from the point of view of Canadian economy, we firmly believe that Canadian citizens want to and should accept their full share of responsibility for people displaced from their homes and security by world conflict.

Yours faithfully,

JOY A. MAINES,  
*Executive Secretary.*

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will now adjourn until to-morrow morning at 10.30, when we will hear representatives of the shipping company. This is a vital question.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: As Mr. Colley told us the other day, it is possible for the inter-governmental committee to get a ship. That does not fit into our pattern, because they have been selecting only the relatives, as you know, and have to cover a wide territory to gather forty or fifty people. It is possible to get a chartered ship.

The committee adjourned until to-morrow, May 1, at 10.30 a.m.

## APPENDIX "A"

T. J. KEENAN,  
Meadowbank Ranch,  
Lac La Hache, B.C.,  
22nd April, 1947.

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCH, P.C.,  
Chairman,  
The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour:  
The Senate of Canada,  
Ottawa, Canada.

HONOURABLE SIR,—With what civic pride our cities boast their growth! The good folk of Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and Winnipeg are justly proud that their cities are the first four jewels in the diadem of our fair Dominion. Increasing population spells prosperity and a higher standard of living for each and every one of us, as we have more backs to bear the burden of our national debt and our national business institutions.

Beyond this simple statement of Canadian opinion as I have found it, there is nothing that I can add. I bring to you no discussion of the philosophies of immigration. I offer you only the civic pride of millions of Canadians in the growth of their own cities, towns, and villages.

It is my privilege to present a case for the eight hundred thousand men, women and children now living in the assembly centres of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I have lived and worked with thousands of these displaced persons in Lubeck, in Echernforde, in Kiel, and in Hambourg as an UNRRA Assembly Centre Director. Further, I had a final posting to Ottawa in January of this year that I might give the Canadian Government first-hand field information regarding displaced persons available for the immigration program of Canada.

My first-hand information was received with enthusiasm by the officials concerned. I was given a most kindly welcome by many Senators who now sit in your Committee; and I have been asked to submit this brief on behalf of my friends who await with fearful hearts the verdict of your deliberations.

Who are the displaced persons for whom I speak? Millions of persons, friends and foes, have been displaced in Europe during the war years. I speak for our friends only. I speak for the displaced persons who have been selected as eligible for UNRRA care after careful screening by the officers of UNRRA and the Military Governments concerned.

At Kiel, Germany, in the autumn of 1946, I was the UNRRA officer in charge of that screening. Working with the camp commandants of that assembly centre and with the assistance of other officers of UNRRA Team 101, I administered the filling out of the questionnaire by every displaced person over the age of 16 years. What excitement there was in the camps! The Ukrainians presented my largest problem because nowhere could I find an Ukrainian translation of the questionnaire, and in Kiel I had four large Ukrainian camps. You understand we could not just turn a questionnaire over to an Ukrainian commandant and have him run off sufficient translations on his camp duplicating machine. The old grapevine being what it is among D.P.'s, the entire Ukrainian community would have full details of the contents of the questionnaire in a matter of a few days.



Finally, I got up early and was away from Kiel before five o'clock in the morning. By six o'clock I was at the big Ukrainian camp of Konigon. There I supervised while the typist, the machine operator, and the Camp Commandant himself all filled out their own questionnaires before going to work on the job of cutting the stencil and running off 150 copies of translations in the Ukrainian language, with its queer Russian alphabet.

With these translations in hand, we all moved over to the great hall of the camp where four long rows of tables had been laid out complete with pens and ink, so that 96 people at once might fill out the fearful questionnaire. On the great stage, and at the front of the hall was our "slow pokes' corner" into which we bundled off the slower ones who were holding up production, while groups of 24 were marshalled beyond the double doors awaiting their turn to fill out the questionnaire which would decide their eligibility for the continued care of UNRRA as displaced persons.

The first groups were excessively nervous. They were fearful that that outcome would be forcible repatriation to the U.S.S.R.,—to their homes that now lie beyond the Curzon Line in Russian-occupied Poland.

But as the first group left the great hall they called cheerfully to their friends waiting in their squads of 24. They told their friends "There's nothing to it—just simple questions about where you've been and what you've done." After that there was much less tension and I went off with the commandant to his private quarters to have a breakfast of Ukrainian cakes and pickled mushrooms which are a great Ukrainian delicacy.

Officers of the UNRRA Team kept relieving one another until nine o'clock that night, when the Registrar turned over the completed questionnaires with all the nominal rolls in apple-pie order, giving a clear record of what had been accomplished.

The next day under the supervision of UNRRA officers, every camp in that Kiel Assembly Centre of over 7,000 displaced persons filled out the questionnaires, in the "S" rooms that we had planned weeks in advance.

I mentioned this "S" day operation in some slight detail in order to demonstrate two points to the Honourable Senators. The one is the care and the secrecy with which we administered the screening questionnaire which was used to separate friend from foe, and which did determine which displaced persons were eligible for UNRRA care.

My second point in giving this word-picture of my "S" Day operation is to suggest the administrative ability that is available among every group of displaced persons in Europe to-day. The careful planning had been done at meetings of camp commandants in my office. There we discussed in three, or sometimes four languages, the work to be done. I stressed the need for speed and secrecy, and the commandants themselves the administrative details.

After the questionnaires had all been filled out and deposited under lock and key in my office, they were read by myself and the other UNRRA officers who made up my screening panel. Our duty was to divide the questionnaires into three groups.

Group I consisted of simon-pure displaced persons. The best documentation to place a D.P. in Group I was a German *Arbeits* card of a German *Arbeits* book issued in Germany during the war years. The German passion for administrative routine has proved helpful to us time and again. It is true that in the first rush of liquidating Polish villages and turning the entire population into slave labour, it was not possible for them to document everything. We found cases in which many persons had worked for two and sometimes three years before being issued with an *Arbeits* card to "legalize" their position as slave workers. But we did find that all slave labour had the documentation there to prove their position and to make them eligible for the care of UNRRA.



Group II consisted of displaced persons not eligible for UNRRA care. The questionnaire had been cleverly constructed. It did its work well. It gave collaborators—an easy opportunity to document themselves as collaborators—all unwittingly. A typical question was one listing ten different documents and after each a man must write “yes” or “no” saying that the document had or had not been issued to him. Two of these documents were quite innocent; but if he said yes in any one of five languages to having received any one of the other eight documents, he was admitting that he had received German nationality in some form or other. Another question asked was, “Do you desire German nationality?” If he said “Yes” to this he automatically was placed in Group II by my screening panel.

Group III consisted of the doubtful cases. In deciding those who should be placed in Group III, my screening panel was guided by a top secret key to the questionnaire. The trick lay in the construction of the questionnaire. A person with a bad conscience attempting to avoid investigation would almost invariably land himself in Group III, and once he was placed in Group III, he must go before the experts of the regional screening board for a very careful investigation of his past history and of the documentation of his past history. Of course this was the very thing that he was trying to avoid; but the questionnaire was very effective in this regard. Final decision and executive action regarding the cancellation of D.P. status is the responsibility of the security officers of the Military Governments concerned and not of UNRRA.

The point I am trying to make is that the officers responsible for UNRRA’s activities in Germany have done a job of work in attempting to separate friend from foe so that to-day Canada can freely accept any displaced persons from UNRRA Assembly Centres and feel that it is not getting collaborators who have given comfort to the enemy.

Of course, as a Canadian speaking to Canadians, I take it for granted that we want to avoid sharing our native country with those who have been war criminals and collaborators.

In Germany I had taken an active part in the work of screening for many months before the questionnaire of which we have been speaking. In Lubeck I organized a screening team composed of my Czechoslovakian Deputy Director and my Dutch secretary. These two interviewed every displaced person in our Assembly Centre. All those suspected of being collaborators were turned over for further investigation to the local screening board which had been organized on my recommendation.

The executive authority for that screening board was the Field Security Major of 626 Mil. Gov. R. Det. If he confirmed the findings of my screening team, he put his signature and stamp on a form letter to the German Burgo-meister of Lubeck. This form letter stated: “The above mentioned is not now a displaced person and is now the responsibility of the German authorities for rations and quarters.”

That was local screening in operation before the directives regarding the questionnaire that covered every UNRRA Assembly Centre in the entire operation.

I don’t like war criminals or collaborators and least of all do I want to see any of these people reach the safety and security of Canada. However, people of this type are always first in the queue when something to their advantage is being dished out.

They came in their tens of thousands when Hitler had Polish property to give away. Under the direction of the Gestapo, the German soldiers had liquidated Polish homes and Polish villages at the point of the tommy-gun. Furniture, farms, clothing, factories,—everything was left behind, as Hitler acquired more slave labour for his war machine, and at the same time acquired

the property of these same slaves that he might give it away to the war criminals and collaborators who flocked in from the neighbouring countries to get their share of the loot.

Not only did these jackals share the plunder of the German arms, but also they took a lead in the liquidation of Jewish people in their native countries. When they killed Jewish people they were allowed to keep the jewelry and the small change while the factories and the good homes went to their Gestapo masters.

These are the Volksdeutsch. They are people born in other countries of German blood or of pretended German blood, for many who aped the Germans were given the same "rights and privileges"! The Volksdeutsch were urged in radio broadcasting by Hitler himself to "come home to the Fatherland." Hitler promised them Polish property and German citizenship even though their families had been born in other countries for generations.

When I was an Assembly Centre Director in Lubeck, I received a directive concerning "persons born abroad of German parentage and now resident in Germany." The directive stated specifically that such persons were not eligible for UNRRA care. The directive went on to state that UNRRA Directors should make every effort to prevent such people obtaining exit visas from Germany for the purpose of resettlement or repatriation to their native lands.

These Volksdeutsch have been displaced by their own greed and by their loyalty to the Fatherland. They are to-day making every effort to confuse themselves with the genuine displaced persons who are in the UNRRA Assembly Centres, awaiting resettlement.

Field security officers and UNRRA officers, all experts in screening, have worked for months separating the sheep from the goats. I urge that only those displaced persons who are fully documented as eligible for the care of UNRRA should be considered as immigrants to Canada. And I urge further that no one else in Germany should be considered for resettlement in Canada until the victims of German aggression have been taken care of.

In Eckenforde last summer a brother and sister came to me for assistance in getting their exit permits for resettlement in Sweden. They did not present the documents which showed that they had accepted German citizenship. They presented a document issued by the German authorities stating that they were foreigners. I suspected them of being Volksdeutsch because of the year in which they had come to Germany. I had questioned them at some length and had just about given up hope of finding proof for my suspicions when I noted that there was no date on the German document that certified that they were foreigners. "Oh, that was issued after Hitler died in the bunker," the sister explained to me. I then discovered that after Hitler's death the German authorities had advised these people to burn all documents showing that they had accepted German citizenship and had given them this other bit of paper. However, the German petty official was too honest to put a false date on the document and he knew that the correct date would render the document quite useless. Therefore he had compromised and issued the document without any date at all. Of course their status as displaced persons was cancelled and as Germans they were not eligible for resettlement in Sweden. The Swedish Red Cross was assisting in the resettlement of the victims of German aggression and did not wish to share the rights and privileges of Sweden with collaborators who had accepted German citizenship when there was bloodstained loot to be shared by the jackals.

#### HARD CORE

Our displaced persons of to-day are definitely "hard core." Only the most optimistic would claim that it is possible to repatriate more than one per cent of those that now remain to their native lands.

Polish repatriation held top priority during the year past. By the 30th of September, 1946, UNRRA had repatriated 634,010 to Poland; 309,900 to Belgium and Luxembourg; 139,950 to Czechoslovakia; 307,950 to Holland, 1,556,100 to France; 13,550 to Greece; 593,060 to Italy; 2,041,760 to the USSR, 208,330 to Jugoslavia.

My own work dealt chiefly with Polish repatriation. We established the policy in Lubeck over a year ago of moving Poles from one camp to another, simply to overcome the inertia of those people wishing to remain in one place. Always we had more Poles for repatriation when we had such a camp movement.

I invented the slogan, "Do you wish to rebuild Germany or Poland?" and this slogan was used effectively throughout the entire British Zone.

The Director-General of UNRRA arranged a sixty-day ration to be given to each person on arrival in Poland by the UNRRA Warehouse Team stationed there for that purpose. An UNRRA Repatriation Team ran a Polish Transit Camp in Lubeck where another Warehouse Team provided extra cigarettes and chocolate bars for those on their way back to Poland.

In our Assembly Centres we had a Repatriation clerk in each Polish camp and he had one of the choice rooms of the Camp assigned to him as his Repatriation Room. A propaganda display was arranged in each Polish camp. There was a very healthy competition between the different Assembly Centres as to who should have the most effective propaganda display. At first the District Repatriation Officer asked for photographs of my propaganda display at Kiel. Then it was the display at Flensburg that was being photographed. Finally, my former Assembly Centre at Eckernforde produced such a display that we were all ordered to Eckernforde that we might admire and imitate it.

Our policy was to "freeze" the better clothing for Polish repatriation. In my warehouse, there were 68 fur coats donated in the Bundles for UNRRA from either the United States or Canada. Some of them were damaged somewhat; but they made quite an impression when we started giving them out to the women who were going back to Poland.

Because the Germans claimed that the Poles were taking home too much loot with them, the Military Authorities issued a directive that any valuables such as bicycles, radios or typewriters would not be permitted on the Repatriation transport unless the Pole had a certificate signed by an UNRRA Assembly Centre Director stating that he had purchased the article with money he had earned in Germany.

For my part, I took my directive in this matter from the Book of Exodus where the Children of Israel were instructed to borrow from the Egyptians before setting out for the Promised Land. I told my Polish friends that I had no scruples about giving them the necessary documentation for anything they wanted to take home.

There were many touching scenes as the lorries loaded in the Camps with a little three- or four-piece band playing National airs, and friends saying goodbye, or giving messages to relatives the others would be seeing in Poland.

We made no attempt to minimize the difficulties that they would face in returning to rebuild their shattered country. We distributed through the Repatriation rooms Polish newspapers from Warsaw that told of the sufferings of those who were rebuilding their homes in the country districts.

Of Baltic repatriation there has been but a trickle. Nor is there likely to be any considerable Baltic repatriation while the former democratic republics of Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania are part of the USSR.

The Yugoslavians who remain call themselves Yugoslav Royalists and wear a tiny coronet in the buttonhole, to indicate that they are not followers of Marshal Tito. We may expect no repatriation from this group.

From what we have just said, I think we may safely conclude that the Displaced Persons now remaining in UNRRA Assembly Centres are definitely hard core and cannot be voluntarily repatriated to their native countries.



## CONDITIONS IN GERMANY

There has been a steady deterioration of living conditions of Displaced Persons in Germany for almost a year now. I left Germany in January of this year. Letters I have since had from Germany all confirm the fact that the living conditions of the Displaced Persons have continued to deteriorate.

Control Commission Germany, or "CCG" as we call it, is the Supreme Authority there. UNRRA functions in Germany under the authority of CCG.

Early in December of last year, I talked to the CCG officer who formulates policy regarding the Displaced Persons Operation. He stated specifically that he was anxious to dispose of the D.P. problem in three ways, and as quickly as possible. His three ways of "solving" the D.P. problem were: (1) repatriation; (2) resettlement, and (3) drive them into the German population. He was referring of course to the Displaced Persons who have been certified as eligible for UNRRA care and who are living in the UNRRA Assembly Centres of Germany today.

Repatriation, as we have shown above, will never solve the problem unless it is to be done at the point of the Tommy-gun.

Resettlement as you may know from bitter experience, is a slow and painful process.

"Driving them into the German population" by allowing our former friends fewer rights and privileges than German citizens seems to me to be a poor reward for those who have suffered in the cause of freedom.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast,"—and the hope of resettlement in Canada persists and maintains the morale of these people in spite of the grim conditions under which they are compelled to live.

Their camp might be big brick army barracks, or the cheap huts of a former slave-labour camp, or a broken-down dance hall, or a German school building. But wherever the accommodation might be the rule was that each was limited to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  metres (about 40 square feet) of living space per person. A year ago we were trying to increase the living space per person and some camps had as much as 5 metres per person. But today every pressure is used to squeeze the D.P.'s down to the official minimum of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  metres.

A thick soup at mid-day is the main meal in the D.P. camps. Other items, such as bread and jam, are issued to families and the mother arranges a morning or evening snack in lieu of breakfast and supper. That mid-day soup is not dished out generously but measured carefully on a strict rationing of so much per person according to his status as heavy worker, moderately heavy worker, light worker, or non-worker.

At the time when I left Germany, all food was coming from German sources in Schleswig-Holstein. In theory, the Displaced Persons were receiving the same ration as that issued to the neighbouring camps of German refugees. In point of fact, however, the rations were divided by German officials, and I constantly received complaints of German officials discriminating against the Displaced Persons.

When my UNRRA Team employed Displaced Persons, the authority was first given by the Pioneer Corps of the British Army; but the final documentation, payment and decision regarding the rate of wages rested with the German labour office.

At Kiel the UNRRA Team employed the German woman who owned the house in which the Mess was located, as a housekeeper. At the same time the Team employed Polish and Latvian girls as secretaries. When the German Labour Office paid the housekeeper more than three times as much in salary as they paid the D.P. confidential secretary, one of the girls said, "Let me go to the kitchen and get more money."



As I left Germany, orders had already been issued that the Displaced Persons were to become directed labour under the German Labour Office. In fact, the D.P.'s are now in no better position than they were four years ago when they were slave labour in the German economy.

When the UNRRA Director of the British Zone announced that the policy of directed labour under the German Labour Office, was soon to be instituted, he uttered the pious "hope" that the UNRRA officers would do "what they could" to prevent the D.P.'s from being "victimized" by the German Labour Office. In other words, he knew perfectly well that the UNRRA officers to whom he was speaking would be powerless to prevent the D.P.'s from being victimized by the German Labour Office.

I think I have made it plain that there has been a steady deterioration in the conditions of life of the Displaced Persons and that they are probably living in poorer circumstances than are the Germans who are living in the refugee camps.

It is certain that the position of the D.P.'s is much worse than that of those Germans who still retain their own homes and farms in the Schleswig-Holstein region.

There are three grounds on which I consider that the men, women and children in our UNRAA Assembly Centres should be given top priority in any immigration policy that may be framed for the Dominion of Canada. Not all of them can be rated as top priority on all three grounds, but most of them can be given a top priority on at least one of the three grounds that we shall now consider.

Our economic need is the first ground on which I would urge the value of the Displaced Persons in any immigration policy that Canada may devise. Sufficient for the moment to state that we have thousands of workers with energy and resourcefulness who can readily be selected by officials of our own Department of Labour in much the same way as officials from the British Ministry of Labour are at the present moment selecting Displaced Persons to fill the labour needs of the United Kingdom.

Our moral obligation is the second ground on which many of our Displaced Persons rate top priority, for resettlement in Canada. I feel that we owe the greatest moral debt to the survivors of those who were dying on the ramparts of freedom before the Canadian people realized that Canada's frontier was on the Rhine, in this modern day and age.

I think Mr. Konstelli, a Yugoslavian journalist who wrote articles in the '30s that landed him in concentration camp when his country in its turn was overrun by the Nazi hordes.

I think of Pera Dubinsky, whose mother died in the Stuttkof concentration camp. Her mother was a Jewish dentist who died three days after being wounded by a stray British bomb that struck the hospital of that concentration camp. The Gestapo Commandant ordered an immediate parade of all wounded with their wounds still bleeding, that his staff might laugh at the spectacle of our friends wounded by our bombing. But the moral obligation of this nation to these survivors need not be stressed by me before this body of Honourable Senators.

Our cultural need for the best that Europe has to offer is the third group on which I would urge that we accept Displaced Persons who need no instruction in democratic citizenship, but who can instruct many of us in the virtues and the value of democracy. These people might well be compared to the United Empire Loyalists who laid the foundations of English-speaking culture in Upper Canada and in the Maritime Provinces. These are the business and professional leaders of the three Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. They

gave leadership to the finest flowering of their national cultures in the years between the wars, when their countries were democratic republics after centuries of oppression.

### OUR ECONOMIC NEED

For the selection of those immigrants who come to Canada to fill the economic needs of the Canadian labour market, I would recommend that Canada follow closely the pattern the British Ministry of Labour is now following.

Some six months ago, the United Kingdom asked for one thousand women as domestic help in the T.B. Sanitaria. The Ministry of Labour laid down specific qualifications of age, health and previous experience. It specified further—rates of pay, hours of work, and general conditions of labour. These details were passed out to the UNRRA Assembly Centre and the initial recruitment was done by the welfare officers of the UNRRA teams. Officers of the British Ministry of Labour then called at the UNRRA Assembly Centres to make their own selections from the applicants.

It was then the duty of the UNRRA officers to arrange the X-ray photographs of each successful applicant and to complete all the necessary documentation in preparation for the next draft for the United Kingdom.

There are two simple points to this type of recruitment. The first point is that they were taking genuine Displaced Persons certified as such by the UNRRA Director of the Assembly Centre concerned before they were interviewed by the Ministry of Labour officials. The second point is that they were recruited strictly on an economic basis to fill a specific need in the labour requirements of the United Kingdom.

In the case of this particular employment scheme, the original thousand women were so successful in their new employment that the Ministry of Labour raised the ante almost immediately; and when I left Germany in January, the Ministry of Labour officials were already back in Germany, seeking 5,000 women as domestic help in T.B. Sanitaria.

For this type of recruitment, which is based primarily on the economic needs of the country, we must move rapidly. In the UNRRA Assembly Centres, there is a mine of capable human beings, men and women skilled and unskilled, but capable of productive work. It is a bargain counter that will not last forever. Great Britain and other nations are already creaming off the Assembly Centres on the basis of their own economic needs. The sooner Canada picks what she wants, the better workers she will get.

Employment officers of UNRRA have compiled statistics regarding the occupations claimed by each and every Displaced Person in the UNRRA Assembly Centres. These statistics issued recently in a special report by UNRRA Director-General Lowell W. Rooks, indicate the economic value of the D.P.'s to the labour markets of the world.

Of agricultural workers, most of them dirt farmers, the Poles have 35.6 per cent. The Ukrainians have 34 per cent. The Baltic peoples from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania report that 15.4 per cent have agriculture as their occupation, while 23.5 per cent of the Yugoslavian D.P.'s are farmers.

These figures are approximate because the UNRRA Employment officers had no means of testing the statements made and because they did not cover the thousands of young people who have grown up in the refugee camps and cannot claim any occupation.

However, these percentage figures do indicate clearly that we are not going to solve the D.P. problem if we plan to take agricultural workers only.

Domestic service by nationality, lists Baltics at seven per cent; Poles 5.9 per cent; Ukrainians 5 per cent, and Yugoslavs 8 per cent. The high percentage of domestic servants now living in D.P. Assembly Centres might be explained by

the fact that these countries have known so many conquerors in generations past that their own nationals are accustomed to domestic service, much as the Saxons were in England after the Norman Conquest.

Fewer than one per cent of all Displaced Persons list "mining and processing" as their occupation.

Thus we may conclude that any policy based solely on the economic needs of our country, by taking only those people needed in the Canadian labour market will fail to solve the problem.

#### MORAL OBLIGATION

Our moral obligation to Displaced Persons varies directly in proportion to what they have suffered in the cause of freedom in the hands of the Nazis. From this point of view, I suggest that we should make four priorities.

Top priority I would give to those who have survived the concentration camps. These people have much to recommend them from other points of view. They must have been possessed of terrific native toughness to have survived a psychological ordeal that broke all but the strongest. As such, they are ideal material to build into the structure of a nation of people as tough and resourceful as the Canadians themselves have proved themselves to be.

There is no question that the experience of this war has shown that there are few nations that can hold a candle to our own Canadians when it comes to rugged toughness under adverse conditions.

Second priority on the ground of our moral obligation, I would give to those people who worked as slave labour for the Germans. In spite of what these people have suffered in being dispossessed of their homes and herded into cattle trucks with what clothing they could take with them, they carried on a resistance movement that constantly undermined the German war machine. Boring from within, they joined forces with us and produced such things as flying bombs that failed to explode.

Camp No. 44 at Kiel-Russee was a punishment camp for slave labour. To-day it is a D.P. camp for Ukrainians. When I suggested that they should have a garden at that camp I was told it was impossible because there were human bones in the ground in every part of the camp.

Fortunately, from the point of view of justice, the slave labour was fully documented, by the Germans in their passion for routine, and therefore we have only to say that we will take so many people who have been slave labour and we can be certain that we will not be getting those who have been war criminals and collaborators.

Like the survivors of the concentration camps, the survivors of slave labour in Germany have the necessary qualities to make them a worthy addition to our Canadian nation.

The conscience of the world cannot rest while those who suffered for the liberty of all continue to suffer amid the chaos and red tape of postwar Germany.

Our Canada is a leader of nations and she must answer the challenge and give leadership in solving the problem of the D.P.'s in Germany today.

Third priority on the ground of our moral obligation I would give to those refugees of the smaller democratic nations who fled from totalitarianism when the Red Army was rolling back Hitler's Eastern front. These refugees are not to be confused with the Volksdeutsch who came to the Fatherland in the early years of the war to take German citizenship and Polish property. These refugees were herded into refugee camps which were later to be consolidated into our UNRRA Assembly Centres after V-E Day.

The fourth and lowest priority on the ground of our moral obligation would be given to the ex-Wehrmacht. These are young men from the Baltic republics who were conscripted into the German Army. They must hold two documents



from the Military Government officials before they can be documented as eligible for UNRRA care. First, they must have a discharge certificate issued by the Allied Military authority. In addition they must have a certificate from a British Army Screening Board stating that they are not Volksdeutsch; that they are not war criminals; and that they did not volunteer for the German Army. Although these young men do not rate a high priority on the grounds of our moral obligation, they should prove the most acceptable group as immigrants. Already they have had the experience of adjusting themselves to life in a foreign country. They are well disciplined; they keep their own camps in good order; they are willing workers and are easily instructed in any new line of work. These boys made up the bulk of the drivers in my Assembly Centres.

From a cultural standpoint the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians are the most attractive group in the UNRRA Assembly Centres today. Every Canadian returning from Europe brings the same story about these Displaced Persons who should come as immigrants to Canada.

They have not been in concentration camps. Very few of them have been documented as slave labour. They are the refugees who fled from totalitarianism as the Red Armies swept into their countries for the second time in 1944.

They had remained in their countries under the USSR after the "mutual defence agreements" had been signed in 1939. They still had remained in their countries when Hitler went on the air under the Rosenberg agreement and invited them to come "home to the Fatherland" along with the Volkdeutsch.

But they fled when the Red Armies appeared a second time and when it seemed to them that there was small chance of their countries again becoming the independent democratic republics that they had themselves created.

Under the previous occupation by the USSR, thousands of Baltic leaders had been liquidated and it appeared that many more would be liquidated with the second arrival of the Red Armies.

I spoke at a Baltic Educational Conference in Lubeck with the walls of the little hall lined with pictures of life in Canada that I had "scrounged" from Canadian Army Educational Services before the Canadians pulled out of Oldenburg. I tried to tell them of the difficulties Canada was having with 1,000,000 from the armed forces and 1,000,000 from the war factories to be reabsorbed into the national economy.

But the Baltic educational leaders refused to believe me. They insisted that there must be some corner in our wide open spaces where peoples as tough and as resourceful as themselves could make a living. A former secretary of a Latvian Embassy spoke up and suggested that the "ghost towns" of British Columbia might provide a haven for them where they could enjoy again the democratic way of life.

Boris Saminoff, a Latvian banker came to work for my team in Eckenforde. I gave him the task of getting 6,000 cubic metres of firewood cut for our camps. I gave him my full authority. He saw the Colonel; he saw the Burgomaster; he saw the Chief Forester. He obtained tools; he recruited labour. He brought many documents to me for my signature; but in actual fact he produced 6,000 cubic metres of wood with little or no supervision on my part.

Mr. Petronus, a brilliant young Lithuanian banker, had been active in the feeding arrangements of Boy Scout camps and had been the bank manager responsible for the employees' co-operative kitchen at the head office of the National Bank of Lithuania. I documented him as a Messing Officer of UNRRA and he did a splendid job of work.

Mr. Rose was an Estonian marine engineer. I gave him the job of finding men, tools and materials to repair all the decrepit huts of my Assembly Centre. Later I brought Rose to Kiel, fully documented as a Deputy Director of UNRRA grade 9. He was the first Displaced Person appointed to this grade in the Schleswig-Holstein region.



Others who did very valuable work were the postmaster of Riga, the area veterinary-surgeon for the district of Riga, the food-controller of Latvia, a ship broker from Esthonia, and a man who had handled 4,000 men on the waterfront of Riga.

These refugee peoples from the democratic Baltic republics look to Canada for their future. Canada attracts these peoples because it is the leader of the smaller democratic nations and also because they feel that the climate and the farming conditions are similar to that of their beloved native lands.

These refugee peoples resemble most closely the United Empire Loyalists who were driven from their homes to start life anew in the wilds of Canada.

Of all the peoples that I have met abroad, this group would fit into our Canadian scheme of things the most readily, and would contribute the most to Canadian culture and to Canadian appreciation of the democratic way of life.

However, because of what these people are, they will never reach Canada on economic grounds without a vast amount of perjury on the part of both themselves and the interviewing officials.

If we are to get any of these refugee peoples to Canada, we must do so under a special scheme devised to meet their peculiar circumstances.

Thus, we have two groups that do not fit into Canadian immigration policy without a specially planned scheme. There are those who have suffered most from the Nazi and there are those who are so close to us politically and culturally that they will assimilate most readily into Canada.

#### OPERATION BEAVER

Camps of two thousand people might be established in Canada for the training and distribution of those immigrants who we feel should come to Canada but who we know cannot be fitted into any general employment scheme for work in basic industry.

Occupations of D.P.'s from the democratic Baltic republics are 15.4 per cent agriculture; 20 per cent administrative personnel; 20 per cent special services; over 13 per cent professions, and the arts, but not including the medical; over 5 per cent health services; 7 per cent domestic service; 10 per cent transport and supply; 4 per cent construction workers and allied crafts; one per cent metal trades workers; a fraction of "mining and processing" and 2 per cent "miscellaneous processing."

Regarding the concentration camp survivors, I have not found any statistics such as those just quoted concerning the Baltic refugees; but we know that the professions and the arts, in fact any people with a flair for leadership, and opposed to the Nazi regime, were the ones placed in the concentration camps. Thus we may assume that the percentage figures for concentration camp survivors are similar to the percentage figures just quoted for the Baltic refugees.

In the entertainment world, Canada has always drawn freely from abroad. Some months ago the De-nazification Commission from Berlin reported that it was quite impossible for it to denazify the German entertainment world, if there were to be any German entertainers left for the German people or the Occupational Forces. Easy enough to prove that they were Nazi; but the work of the Commission was to put such people to work as common labourers and not to permit them to carry on as professional people. The point I am making is that while we continue to draw artists of the entertainment world, we must bar all such of German nationality. If we do not do so, we shall have Canadians applauding those who took the lead in the extermination of the Jews. Jewish leaders in German entertainment were some of the first to be sent to the Concentration Camps, that room might be made on the German stage for "artists" returning from abroad.

A recent report in the *Vancouver News-Herald* told of a certain troupe of Ritters who had returned to Germany in 1938, and who are now coming to Canada for the Pacific National Exhibition. This sort of thing should be stopped.

However, there are many displaced persons with outstanding training and talent in the Arts. If such people were to come under our special camps' scheme, they would demonstrate to the people of Canada, on the stage and on the radio, the cultural calibre of these displaced persons.

"Operation Beaver" is the name that I would suggest for these special camps; because there are so many of these displaced persons who would be self-employed with their own arts and crafts. They would be working like beavers producing things of utility and beauty out of our native Canadian materials.

I am wearing a solid silver ring of ancient Latvian design. It was presented to me in recognition of the work that I had done in "scrourging" tools and materials to set up a silversmith's shop in a D.P. Assembly Centre in Lubeck.

Skilled woodworkers who produced articles of amazing beauty made from Luftwaffe propellers, would quickly find ways and means of producing artistic things from our own native Canadian woods.

"Operation Beaver" is bound to be a success from the start. The expense would be small and the dividends great. One such camp with accommodation for 2,000 people, using surplus Canadian Army equipment throughout, would give leadership to the whole world and might solve the D.P. problem within a year, as other nations followed Canadian leadership in this matter.

We cannot ask Canadian banks to make bank managers out of refugee bankers. We cannot ask the Canadian Medical Association to accept great members of D.P. medical personnel. But these people by the position they attained previously in their native lands, have demonstrated that they have brains and ability. They are responsible people. They will not come here expecting to carry on in their own business or profession. They ask only to be given a chance to fit themselves into the Canadian scheme of things using the intelligence that they have already so amply demonstrated they possess.

Landing permits should be delayed for all those arriving under Operation Beaver. The burden would then rest with themselves and Canadian organizations such as the Canadian National Refugees' Committee to which Senator Cairine Wilson has given leadership. Hundreds of other Canadian organizations have urged Canada's moral obligation to the displaced persons. "Operation Beaver" would give all such organizations ample opportunity to demonstrate the contribution that these displaced persons can make to the building of a prosperous Canada, and how easily it can be done.

The few failures on "Operation Beaver" would be shipped back to Germany if they had demonstrated that they could not fit into the scheme of things.

The English language has long been used freely in the seaport towns of the Baltics. For years there has been an English college in Riga, the capital of Latvia. Therefore, the basic groundwork of surmounting the language barrier has already been done. The Adult Education Agencies of Canada stand ready to complete the work of overcoming the language barrier completely, so that these people would have at least a fluent knowledge of Basic English before being absorbed into the Canadian population. I had recently a letter from an official of the Adult Education Department of the Province of Saskatchewan. This official maintains that fluent Basic English could be taught in the transit camps of Germany and on the boat coming over. How much better the job could be done in the camps functioning under "Operation Beaver"!

## UNDERTAKING REQUIRED

In order that there might be no misunderstanding on the part of the individual displaced persons, I propose that an "Undertaking" should be drawn up and printed in several languages, to be signed by each and every adult arriving under "Operation Beaver."

This "Undertaking" should state in clear and simple terms that Canada is giving to these people an opportunity only to demonstrate that they can fit themselves into the Canadian scheme of things. It should state clearly that they are not being given authority to practise the business or profession for which they have been trained, and also it should state that they are prepared to return to Germany without question if, in the opinion of the officials concerned, they have failed to find a niche for themselves in Canada.

Honourable Senators, I have spoken to you as a native-born Canadian who has had some three years' experience giving some leadership in Educational Services of the Canadian Army Overseas. Also I have had seventeen months as an officer of Field Grade with the D.P. operation in Germany. In addition, I have now had three months in Washington and in Canada, east and west, during which I have discussed many phases of these matters.

In this brief, I have attempted to give factual information in understandable form, and a few constructive suggestions.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you for the opportunity that you have given me of doing something in the interests of Canada, and also for my friends the displaced persons.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS JAMES KEENAN

Meadowbank Ranch,  
Lac La Hache,  
B.C.







Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada Immigration and Labour  
Standing Committee, 1947

1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

## Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 5

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

Lieut.-Colonel Arthur J. Hicks, Ottawa, Ontario, former Staff Officer,  
Military Government in Europe.

Mr. Arthur Randles, C.B.E., M.S.M., Montreal, Quebec, Director and  
General Passenger Manager, Cunard Donaldson Limited (Montreal).

Mr. Carl E. Waselius, Montreal, Quebec, District Manager, Swedish  
American Line.

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1947

JUN 2 1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine,	Donnelly,	McGeer,
Blais,	Dupuis,	Molloy,
Bouchard,	Euler,	Murdock,
Bourque,	Ferland,	Pirie,
Buchanan,	Haig,	Robertson,
Burchill,	Hardy,	Robinson,
Calder,	Horner,	Roebuck,
Campbell,	Hushion,	Taylor,
Crerar,	Lesage,	Vaillancourt,
Daigle,	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> ),	Veniot,
David,	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> ),	Wilson.

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, 1st May, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators Murdock—Chairman, Burchill, David, Ferland, Hushion, Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor and Wilson—10.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc. a

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Lieut-Colonel Arthur J. Hicks, Ottawa, Ontario, former Staff Officer, Military Government in Europe, was heard and read a brief on displaced persons in Europe and the type of immigrants available for immigration into Canada, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Arthur Randles, C.B.E., M.S.M., Montreal, Quebec, Director and General Passenger Traffic Manager, Cunard Donaldson Limited (Montreal), was heard and read a brief on the facilities of the Steamship Companies he represents for the movement of immigrants from Europe to Canada, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Carl E. Waselius, Montreal, Quebec, District Manager, Swedish American Line, was heard with respect to the movement of immigrants to Canada and the arrangements in Europe for examination of prospective immigrants to Canada.

At 11.55 a.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday, 7th May, at 10.30 a.m.

ATTEST:

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

## THE SENATE

THURSDAY, May 1, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, the first speaker this morning will be Lt. Col. Arthur J. Hicks, former staff officer, Military Government in Europe.

The members of the committee will recollect Colonel Hicks addressed us last year, and gave us some exceedingly valuable information about conditions in Europe. The steering committee, therefore, thought it wise and appropriate to bring his information up to date, and to tell us what further he can from his intimate knowledge and experiences in Europe.

Lt. Col. ARTHUR J. HICKS: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have taken the liberty of going somewhat further than I did last year, when I presented a brief to this committee. I had incorporated in this brief some of the things with which I dealt last year. I am treating them in a slightly different manner. With your permission I should like to read the brief I have prepared.

In July last year I had the honour of appearing before the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, and presented at that time a brief dealing with displaced persons and ex-allied prisoners of war in Germany. I should like to present to you at this time a further brief dealing with those people with whom I came in contact in Germany during the thirteen months I was there, and to present a case for the admission of many of them as immigrants into Canada. I have noted, with interest, the order of reference of this committee, and shall follow in general its sequence of parts.

### INTRODUCTION:

For many years I have taken an interest, a private interest if you like, in the growth of Canada's population, and the emergence of our country as a full fledged nation. In common with most Canadians I have met representatives of practically all of the races which go to make up our Canadian population, and the war gave me an opportunity of seeing many of their countries of origin for the first time. It gave me too the chance to observe a number of those peoples in an environment totally different from our own, an environment pregnant with fear and hardship and one which tested their character and fortitude to the limit.

### THE DESIRABILITY OF ADMITTING IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA:

One of the things about Canadians that astonished people overseas, and there were many things, was the great pride all had in Canada and the Canadian way of life. I assure you that many of you would hardly recognize the places of which the boys spoke, so flowery was their description of them. We have during the course of the last century taken many steps toward that goal of full nationhood to which we all aspire, and now stand before the world, a proud and independent people. The vision that I see, that all of us I am sure see, is of a country rich in its natural resources, and richer still in its teeming millions of hardy people. To have the one without the complement of the other is to invite disaster. Any student of history knows that history does repeat itself; he knows too that to expect a small population to be able to hang



on to a country of huge area, rich in natural resources, is to invite disaster. In this world, acquisitiveness is a natural urge, of individuals and nations alike. If we had the fecundity of our grandparents, and could be guaranteed three hundred years of uninterrupted and uninhibited population growth, with security during that period, we would have little to fear. Unhappily, however, we can be guaranteed neither the one nor the other.

In the science of genetics one often comes across the expression "hybrid vigour". We have examples of hybrid vigour in animals and plants, in human individuals and in peoples. We have a good example of it in our Canadian people, and also in the people of the great nation to the south of us. Despite such expressions as "a melting pot", used generally in a derogatory sense, I think it has been amply demonstrated that the immigration of large numbers of people from Europe to North America and their admixture with the indigenous people has produced a people remarkably alike for their progressiveness and vigour, and all the better for the introduction of many of the customs which those immigrants brought with them.

#### THE TYPE OF IMMIGRANT WHICH SHOULD BE PREFERRED

*Origin.*—The majority groups in Canada are of peoples who came to this country from North Europe and the British Isles. Those from France and the British Isles, speaking a tongue common to our own, and having grown up under the same kind of government as our own, have in general proved most easily adaptable to our way of life. Since I came originally from England, and might be thought to have a bias in favour of the people from there, I might point out that most of the forebears of the members of this Committee also came from there, and events of the present century would tend to prove that the qualities of fortitude, patience, ingenuity and adaptability exhibited by their ancestors, are still possessed in no small measure by the inhabitants of those islands. It is from here that one could expect immigrants skilled in the trades important in our industrial development.

People from other North European countries are racially similar to ourselves, and, judging by the experience of the past, are generally readily assimilated into our population. They face greater difficulties than French or British in regard to language, but their sturdy doggedness and industry are assets which help to carry them through. It is from such countries that many of our farmers and forest workers have come in the past, and they and their ancestors have done much to settle and develop our western provinces.

#### AVAILABILITY OF SUCH IMMIGRANTS FOR ADMISSION

I do not propose to deal here with availability of the people from the British Isles, but would like to present a case for many of the people amongst whom and for whom I worked in Germany.

Of the millions of people who were wrested from their homes and transported about Europe during the war years many hundreds of thousands still remain in Germany. I had a great deal to do with those in the British zone and know what their difficulties are. The big majority of those who remain today are people who have refused to go back to the countries of their origin because those countries are in the grip of a political system which is anathema to them. They yearn for a new start in life and had every expectation that they would be afforded the opportunity to begin afresh. Practically all of those I knew hoped to be able to get to Canada or the United States and were willing to make great sacrifices to do so.

The Baltic peoples, Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians were particularly impressive. They were in the main farmers and forest workers and were intelligent, clean cut fine sturdy types.

The Poles, who formed the largest group of displaced persons, were also mostly farmers, possessing many of the qualities, both good and bad, of the peasant. They were sturdy people, but had a much lower standard of living than most of the other people with whom we had to deal.

The Ukrainians were predominantly farmers and their families. They were a sturdy and cleanly people.

The Yugoslavs were mainly members of the Yugoslav army, ex-prisoners of war who had remained in Germany. They were a fine breed of men and came in the main from small towns and villages.

The people I have mentioned are available as immigrants and the Baltic peoples, the Ukrainians, most of the Poles and many of the Yugoslavs would in my opinion make excellent settlers. They are predominantly of farming stock and Canada still has a place for such as they.

The Baltic peoples have taken the lead in the British zone in setting up schools, including agricultural schools and two of the most important subjects on the syllabus are English and the British system of government.

#### THE FACILITIES, RESOURCES AND CAPACITY OF CANADA TO ABSORB, EMPLOY AND MAINTAIN SUCH IMMIGRANTS.

Nobody doubts that Canada has a wealth of natural resources far in excess of our population's ability to utilize them. We are in effect still in the pioneer stages of development, and there is no reason why this country of ours should not support a population at least three times that of its present one. The problem, if there be a problem, is not the capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain immigrants, but the rate at which we can absorb them.

#### THE APPROPRIATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH ADMISSION.

I have no submission to make regarding the clause, but would like to leave one thought with you. It has been computed that a man's earning capacity up to age 65 in Canada is \$45,000, and a woman's \$4,000.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Oh!

Colonel HICKS: That is, in Canada. Those are official figures.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: That will have to be taken up with the Bureau of Statistics!

Colonel HICKS: Yes; I do not like some of their methods of computation.

I remember reading too, some years ago a statistical work which stated that a child born in Canada had an intrinsic value to Canada of somewhere around \$10,000. I have recently noted that the cost of transporting a displaced person from Europe to central Canada is \$250.

That is the only part I wanted to read.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Does that mean the cost of raising a Canadian child?

Colonel HICKS: No: I think that is a figure that is computed as a result of several factors; one, the cost of raising a child; two, the percentage of people who live out of a thousand people born; or three, total earning power if one can put the intrinsic value of an individual to the country in terms of money—is something in the neighbourhood of \$10,000.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: He consumes as well as produces.

Colonel HICKS: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Of course that works out rather to our advantage, if we can get fully grown people, ready educated.

Colonel HICKS: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What does it cost?

Colonel HICKS: It costs \$7,500 to bring an average child to working age. That includes education and so on. That is Bureau of Statistics figures.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And we get them free, if we only ask for them. When you spoke about that difference in the intrinsic value of the man and the woman, you were figuring on their producing power, and not really their complete contribution, because any figures of that kind do not take family life into consideration.

Colonel HICKS: No, that was not taken into consideration. It was earning power from the point of view of wages which accrue to individuals.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: If the wife stays at home and raises a family she does not come into your calculations at all.

Colonel HICKS: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The husband does.

Colonel HICKS: He does.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is the reason for the distinction in the figures.

Colonel HICKS: That is right.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes. I resented it very much when I always had to put in "No occupation". My husband, who was retired, could claim one.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I will confirm that you are occupied, if you do not have an occupation.

The CHAIRMAN: What position do you hold now, Colonel Hicks?

Colonel HICKS: At the moment I am with Consolidated Paper Corporation in Pembroke. I was on the research division of the Department of Agriculture before the war in Ottawa.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There was a colonel, whose name I cannot remember, who was taken prisoner off the *Zam-Zam*. He said he was always getting into trouble because he was going out and investigating the children whom he found running wild at that time; and he worked out a very careful scheme to bring them to Alberta, under an organization connected with the Alberta government. But we questioned the possibility of finding the children. I have not heard anything about it. Did you know him? I will have to look up the report; I have it somewhere. The scheme he had was very interesting.

Colonel HICKS: No. The only scheme I knew of or had anything to do with there was a scheme for finding and returning to Holland, particularly, a great many very young children who had been removed from refugees and so on in Holland, to Germany. But there was, in my area in Germany anyway, no established scheme outside of a Jewish scheme. There was a definite Jewish scheme, but there was no established scheme to take on young children.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Because of conditions, the proportion of children is, unfortunately, rather small in any case. However I must not be wasting your time.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I suppose you are getting impatient, are you not, Colonel, on what you are able to do?

Colonel HICKS: No, I am not. I know these things have to be done slowly. I have a great feeling for these people whom I left over there. I became very fond of them. I had a great deal to do with them, and I know that it only takes a few months of the kind of existence they are living to embitter them and turn them into something which they really are not. Most of them have come through their experience—and my information is recent—remarkably well, especially the Baltic peoples.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are you satisfied with 52 as a total acceptance up to date?



Colonel HICKS: No, I am not. I am not at all satisfied with that. But I can't do much about it. If I could I would. They are impressive people; they would make worthy citizens here. They are people who pulled themselves out by their own boot straps in Germany. They ran their own schools. By hook or by crook they have got farms, which they run themselves. I think they are an admirable people.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Had they been used as slave labour or were they treated a little better than some of the others?

Colonel HICKS: Theirs was a peculiar history. They were overrun, as you know, by the Russians, with German connivance, or at least acquiescence. That was before the war started, or perhaps it was in the first year of the war. When the Germans invaded Russia the Russians were driven out of those Baltic countries, and once more these people were comparatively free. At least, if it was an exchange of masters, it was for the better as far as they were concerned. Many of them were taken into Germany proper as workers. When the Russians advanced again and overran the Baltic provinces many of these people, having already memories of one Russian occupation, retired behind the German armies, and that is where we found most of them—along the banks of the river Elbe, around Hamburg, and in the province of Hanover. The majority of them, especially the Lithuanians and the Estonians, were farming people; the Latvians were a mixture of professional and farming people, and by our standards they ranked quite high.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It is rather distressing to find, as Mr. MacKay told us last week, and the idea seems pretty general among the military, that the Germans were only too anxious to please the occupying forces, certainly at first, and that the people who were taken as slave workers were somewhat resentful at what occurred, feeling that the Germans were being better treated. I am quite distressed that those who have been over there with the occupying forces do not seem to take into account what these people have suffered at the hands of the Germans, that their spirit could not fail to be somewhat broken. I do not think the Baltic peoples have suffered to quite the same extent from being made slave labour.

Colonel HICKS: Not so much, for instance, as the Poles, who suffered greatly.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: And, I suppose, even some of the French and the Hollanders.

Colonel HICKS: Yes. Most of the French whom I handled—and an awful lot came through my hands—were ex-prisoners of war, and they were in general in remarkably good physical condition. I was surprised.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: There are two questions I would like to ask. We have been told that there are 100,000 of these Baltic people displaced. Is that about correct?

Colonel HICKS: That, I think, would be a good figure for the British and American zones.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The figure that we got was 180,000, but I understand that 100,000 have signed that they would like to come to Canada.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is what I understand.

Colonel HICKS: The majority of the ones that I had, expressed a preference for Canada. They put it to me that they had read a lot about Canada. Some of them had relations in Canada and they were sure that they would feel at home here. And the country is like theirs topographically and so on.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Then, we have been told that one of the reasons why the problem of displaced persons has been held up, as far as Canada is



concerned, is that a great many of them, or at least some of them, are enemy aliens, and under our present regulations they are not admissible. The Baltic people, I take it, would not come under that classification.

Colonel HICKS: They are never classed as enemy aliens. As a matter of fact, none of the peoples of whom I speak could be classed as enemy aliens; that is, the Baltic peoples, the Poles and the Ukrainians. We had in our own area alone between five and ten thousand people who were really Ukrainians. They called themselves of Polish nationality, claiming that they came from the eastern area of Poland, which the Russians overran at the time Germany first overran Poland. There was a Ukrainian minority there. They were an excellent class of people. They refused to go back to what was Russia, if they did come from that part of Poland. Anyway, they said they would rather die than go back. They could not be classed as enemy aliens.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The president of the large association of Ukrainian women here left Europe when she was, I think, seventeen or eighteen years old, but she had lived under four separate regimes.

Colonel HICKS: The Ukrainians were very sharply divided. There were a large number of Ukrainians among the Russian prisoners of war and D.P.s whom we sent back to Russia who were keen on going back—at least, they went back—but some of them were not keen.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Colonel Hicks, for coming to us and giving us this valuable information.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, we also have here representatives of two shipping companies. Mr. Arthur Randles, of the Cunard Donaldson Limited and the Cunard White Star Limited is one of these. He appeared before us last year and gave information as to the shipping space available for the bringing of immigrants. The steering committee invited him back to bring his information up to date.

Mr. ARTHUR RANGLES, C.B.E., M.S.M., Director and General Passenger Traffic Manager of Cunard Donaldson Limited, Montreal, General Representative in Canada of the Cunard White Star Limited and Donaldson Atlantic Line: Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the Senate Committee, I have a very short brief on this occasion.

First of all, I thank you for inviting me to appear before you again.

1. When I appeared before this honourable committee on the 31st of July, 1946, I submitted a brief aimed at demonstrating the important role played by the transatlantic steamship companies in the development and handling of immigration to Canada. I concluded my argument by stressing the importance to the steamship operators of an early declaration by this government of a long-term immigration policy.

2. In the period which has intervened since this committee issued its report of the 13th of August, 1946, certain orders in council have relaxed some of the previous prohibitive regulations, but the effect of the concessions made has been limited by their restriction to people to whom circumstances of personal relationship apply.

The amendments make provision for the entry of workers to engage in the mines, forests, etc., and by an order in council signed a few days ago the contract labour restriction has been removed. As far as I know, no steps have been taken or authority given to those concerned to go out and recruit people suitable for this type of labour, of which such a great need in Canada is apparent.

3. Other arrangements have been agreed to so as to permit the entry into Canada of farm families with capital at their disposal. It is unlikely that many families in Europe can so qualify.

I might point out that I learned only yesterday that the Czechoslovakian government allows settlers to leave with only \$10 in cash, and preferably with their fare paid on this side.

4. There is still an insistant demand from people in Europe, and from Britain in particular, for entry into Canada, and it is also not overlooked that the regulations still permit people of British nationality to enter Canada without procuring so-called "permits of entry", provided they are healthy and have sufficient means to maintain themselves until they are established.

5. The shortage of steamship accommodation from Europe to Canada remains as acute as it was when I appeared before you last. In fact, it is a little worse. So far as the Cunard White Star is concerned, we have been endeavouring to procure the return to our services of several passenger liners still in the service of the United Kingdom Ministry of Transport.

We had hoped that our *Ascania* would have been released to us 'ere this, and we planned to utilize this vessel on a somewhat austere basis, rather than to delay her return to commercial service by a thorough reconditioning.

However, circumstances have arisen which have retarded the vessels release from her present employment. We are not without encouragement to believe that the *Ascania* will be released, though somewhat later than originally contemplated. Under present conditions the ship will carry about 850 people each voyage, which would be once a month.

Larger ships of the Cunard White Star have been operating to and from Halifax and the United Kingdom since this honourable committee last met. The *Queen Mary* and the *Maurentania* both visited Halifax last fall, but they were on a transport basis and carried official passengers as well as large numbers of brides and children. The former *Aquitania*, also under Ministry of Transport employment, has made a considerable number of voyages between Southampton and Halifax and it is hoped that as official traffic between Europe and Canada is now nearly all exhausted, this large vessel may continue in service for some months to come and be able to convey as many emigrants as possible in suitable but austere accommodation. I don't know how much space could be made available, but my personal guess is that from 1,500 to 2,000 or even 2,500 immigrants might be carried each trip. However, this depends upon many unknown factors. The honourable members of the committee will appreciate, however, that the *Aquitania* is still a Ministry transport and conditions overseas may necessitate her employment elsewhere, on government duty.

6. The foregoing represents about all that the Cunard White Star can contribute for some months to come towards the relief of the situation. We have several other vessels under government control, which while not previously engaged on the Canadian trade, might, if released from their present employment, be available to assist temporarily in the emergency.

7. The foregoing paragraphs deal entirely with the present and immediate situation. I noted from the evidence of the Hon. H. L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of National Resources, and A. L. Jolliffe, Esq., I.S.O., Director of Immigration, that this government has acquainted the United Kingdom authorities with the pressing need for tonnage to carry immigrants to Canada. It is known that the Australian Government have been successful in similar representation. They took three ships. In fact, they nearly took the *Aquitania*.

8. With regard to the future, I covered in my first brief the problem to be faced by the company in determining what service of ships shall be provided by the maintenance of the Canadian passenger trade.

At the expense of repetition, I repeat that the cost of building high-class modern passenger liners is many times in excess of pre-war cost. Such a ship has a normal life of only twenty years, and in this trade depends for a great proportion of its earnings on the carriage of immigrant passengers. If there is

not a steady flow of immigrants westbound and a satisfactory demand for east-bound passages, the vessels will be sailing with a large amount of empty accommodation, which cannot be utilized for any other purpose.

Through the deprivations of the war, there are not sufficient vessels afloat capable of maintaining a satisfactory regular immigrant service, and no owner can produce new tonnage at present prices unless there are firm indications of a continuous and reasonable flow of traffic. The volume of immigrant traffic can be determined by the establishment of a definite, concrete and long-term policy of immigration by this dominion.

Those are the few notes I have made. I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Would you mind telling us what work these ships are engaged in now?

Mr. RANGLES: Troop carrying. Britain has I do not know how many million troops abroad yet.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Is there any possibility of utilizing some of the United States tonnage? What is happening to the United States boats?

Mr. RANGLES: I do not know, senator, as they do not belong to us. Some of the American ships have been carrying people, but I do not know how satisfactory the service is. They are not regular passenger ships.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I saw that there were complaints by UNRRA officials who came out on some of them.

Mr. RANGLES: I saw that the other day. But the *Aquitania* is a very large ship, 46,000 tons. She has been carrying troops back and forth between Australia, Africa and all over the world. She is thirty-three years old now, and the cost of reconditioning her would be unreasonable, because she has not got enough life left to amortize the expenditure. She is still on government work.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But she is still a good ship?

Mr. RANGLES: Yes. She has three classes of accommodation, but none of them up to pre-war standards. She has some A accommodation for about 600 passengers, and we have no difficulty in filling that every three weeks. She has some B accommodation, which has been used by warrant officers and others of that rank. That accommodation consists of dormitories for 30, 40 and even 50 and 60 people each. Then she has C accommodation for a large number of men in three-tier bunks. It is quite possible to utilize some of that accommodation, but the point is that the ship is under the control of the British government and will so remain. I have suggested to the appropriate people in Ottawa that the present need of bringing people to Canada—of which I think the government is now aware—necessitates tonnage, and the only way of getting it is for this government to approach the United Kingdom government to continue to operate the ship on her present basis. It is our ship, and we manage it, but it is the government that controls the financial aspect.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And where the ship goes?

Mr. RANGLES: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: According to reports, many of the grade A passengers on the *Aquitania* found the accommodation superior to that on the *Queen Mary*.

Mr. RANGLES: Yes. The *Acquitania's* space is not bad. Sometimes husbands and wives have to be separated, because six ladies have to be placed in one room and six men in another. But that is a wartime condition.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Rangles, you say that it is our ship?

Mr. RANGLES: No, it is the British Government's.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Does that mean a Canadian ship?



Mr. RANGLES: No, I did not say it was our ship; it is the British Government's ship. When I say "our ship", I mean the Cunard White Star Line. The ship belongs to us, and she is under charter to the British Government.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is she of Canadian register?

Mr. RANGLES: No, she is of British register. If the government of Canada—and I am speaking off the record—would say to the government of Great Britain, "We need this ship; we can bring 2,500 people every three weeks on it," I am quite sure that the British Government might be inclined to continue operating under present conditions. But if she were to be put back on a commercial basis, she would have to go in for a survey and overhaul reconditioning which might take a year, quite apart from the excessive costs.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Keenleyside knows of that?

Mr. RANGLES: He knows of it, and so does Mr. Glenn. The question of new ships in the future concerns us very greatly. I ascertained from one of my senior chiefs on the other side, that the cost of building a ship suitable for the Montreal-London, for the Montreal-Liverpool trade, would be about £2½ million. That is a ship that has a life of twenty years. One can imagine that the company is very apprehensive about investing in four or five ships at that price, to find out that by order in council immigration can be cut off. That is what happened to us in the past. Immigration is a tap that can be easily turned off by order in council. We might invest 50 million dollars in ships with no return. Immigration Department specifications cannot be used for anything else; it can be used only for lower paid type passages, but cannot be used to carry freight. A ship of the type which we need has to carry highly specialized freight, such as refrigerator cargoes; Canada needs that type of ship.

We are happy that we contributed so much last year—perhaps more than this committee realizes. A number of ships that we have left are ferrying in and out of Halifax, and when there was a little room over the brides and children we brought quite a number of immigrants.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Can you give us any idea of the number?

Mr. RANGLES: No, I haven't got them in my head. The Immigration Department can tell you. I know that in connection with displaced persons the inter-governmental committee on refugees has representatives over there. They are now examining people who might have relatives in Canada, to see who will be suitable for health and political backgrounds, if they can find that out. The *Aquitania* brought 52 persons on its first voyage and is now on the water with another 50. As time goes on and as the ship is available there will be many more. Those people can be adequately accommodated on a ship like the *Aquitania* in its present position.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The hope for the future lies largely in the *Aquitania*?

Mr. RANGLES: The *Aquitania* and the return of the *Ascania*, which I hope to get back in a month or two.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is the capacity of the *Ascania*?

Mr. RANGLES: 850.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Suppose we could get another ship, before making effective use of it for the business we have in mind it would be necessary to provide a lot more machinery on the other side to gather up the people and bring them to a port.

Mr. RANGLES: Without a guarantee we would want some assurance that there would be a volume of traffic. I do not think there is any doubt that we would get it. People are clamouring at immigration ships to come to Canada.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is from Great Britain.

Mr. RANGLES: Great Britain.



Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I am speaking more of displaced persons from the continent.

Mr. RANGLES: It takes time to examine people. The Immigration Department is perhaps better aware of that than I am.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Under the present process it will take a long time.

Mr. RANGLES: I was Continental Manager of the Cunard Line in continental Europe, and I know many of the languages. I think it might be difficult for Canadians through interpreters, to search the background of the people and work through this lengthy process.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The inter-governmental committee has a good many of their backgrounds.

Mr. RANGLES: I saw Wing Commander Innes when he was here. He is the Deputy Director. It takes a long time, because of the flexibility of the language and people cannot identify themselves, to work through this process. I recall that after the First War it was impossible for a Ukrainian to identify where he had been born. The only record was in the church, and it had been burned down.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You have given us a very concise statement, Mr. Randles; there is a lot of meat in what you have said.

Mr. RANGLES: I am glad to be of any help at all. It is my business to carry passengers and we have been doing it for 107 years.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is any way we can help you out, we will do it.

Mr. RANGLES: The position, Mr. Chairman, of the steamship companies—and I am sure my colleague from the Swedish Jamaica Line will tell you the same thing—is that we are always on a string. We would like a clearer policy, if it is possible to establish one. We do not know where we stand. Of course you cannot predict the economic conditions of the future any more than we can, but if it is possible to establish some policy, whatever it may be, it would be of great assistance.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: You were left in a very unhappy position because of ships that were built during the 20's at high costs?

Mr. RANGLES: Yes, Madame Senator, we built eight ships for this trade, costing \$5 million each. They were busy for a little time, and then the depression came along of course—which no one can control—and after that those ships were practically losing money. Now the people who spend the company's money, such as the shareholders, are apprehensive. A ship of a similar type with modern improvements costs two and a half times as much, even if one could be built. There is no tonnage in the world that one can go and find; everybody is in the same situation. We had eight ships, and we have only one left. We have large ships like the *Queen Mary* and the *Mauretania* coming into New York, and that is the most suitable way to bring people in.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Mr. Randles, is it a fact that the British Government have a considerable number of our vessels?

Mr. RANGLES: Canadian vessels?

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Yes.

Mr. RANGLES: No, you have no vessels.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: We have boats of some kind.

Mr. RANGLES: They are cargo ships. I knew something about them when I was up here for six years dealing with them; but they do not carry passengers.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: We have supply ships too, and I understand that the British Government should have returned them quite some time ago, but they are using them for some good reason.

Mr. RANGLES: Britain sent some ships here to be converted to supply ships for specific trade, but they are not our ships.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The ships of the Canadian Government to which I am referring are chartered to the British Government, and they are still in their hands, and are not being returned in accordance with the contract or understanding, for a very good reason perhaps. There are one hundred odd ships there, and if passengers wanted to come to Canada would it not be possible to use those ships for that purpose?

Mr. RANGLES: No; we went into that question. When I was in Ottawa on loan to the government, I sat in a committee with the different defence departments to see if it were possible to convert some of our ships for the purpose of facilitating the movement of troops. We found they were not capable of carrying troops. The ships will not carry enough fresh water and there is not sufficient deck space.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: In emergency cases it does not take very long to cross the ocean, and I was wondering if it were not possible to use these ships for that purpose?

Mr. RANGLES: No.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: They would not be suitable?

Mr. RANGLES: They would not be safe.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Do you know why the British Government keeps those ships?

Mr. RANGLES: They are carrying cargo.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Where?

Mr. RANGLES: All over the world. They have 88 of them.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Could we not carry something too if we had those ships?

Mr. RANGLES: I do not know. We had 196 of them, and the Canadian Government has disposed of them to Canadian operators. You would have to find somebody to buy them.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: There are plenty of buyers, I understand, for supply ships.

Mr. RANGLES: But they cannot carry passengers. It is impossible to convert them.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: In the camps where these persons are living, and in camps here, they do not have showers and luxurious accommodation that other people would want; and it would take only a few days to cross the ocean.

Mr. RANGLES: These ships go only ten knots an hour, and it would possibly take ten or fifteen days. They are not suitable, not capable, and would not be safe.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are these ships engaged in carrying cargo for Canada?

Mr. RANGLES: No, they are part of our contribution to the mutual aid to Britain.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Does that not at least give us a bargaining force? If we let them have cargo ships they might let us have the *Aquitania* or some ship that can take care of our needs?

Mr. RANGLES: That is an argument that I could not bring forward. You can do that. These ships were loaned for a common purpose to Britain at a dollar a year. They are still employed in carrying cargo of various kinds all over the world. Many of them come to Canada. But they only carry a certain type of cargo; they cannot carry meat or butter, or any refrigeration cargo. They have no refrigeration space.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The supply ships have refrigeration?

Mr. RANGLES: But of a limited capacity. Those supply ships really do not belong to us; they were built for a special purpose, in the Pacific, and because of the early termination of the Japanese war the internals of many of them were not completed.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: My information is—and no doubt you know better—that they have refrigeration.

Mr. RANGLES: But there is not sufficient refrigeration; and the distribution of tonnage as to quality and what it carries is on a mutual basis between Britain and Canada.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: My thought was that, if the ships were available and suitable, and since it costs two or three hundred dollars to bring a man over from Europe—which is a lot of money for a poor man—that people might be brought on these ships, which would be an encouraging and helpful arrangement.

Mr. RANGLES: No, unfortunately those ships are not suitable. The prospect of their use has been explored, and we could not even use them for our own troops.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Randles, for the information you have given us.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The next witness is Mr. Carl E. Waselius of Montreal, who is the District Manager of the Swedish American Line. I remarked in the course of Mr. Waselius' presentation before the committee last year that it was the most encouraging we had heard. I think perhaps he can now give us some more encouraging news.

Mr. CARL E. WASELIUS, District Manager of Swedish American Line, Montreal: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Senators, since I last appeared at one of these meetings a good deal has taken place and I wish to thank Senator Roebuck for inviting me again to give evidence before this Committee.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear here today. I shall try not to use too much of the time allotted for this meeting and as the members of this Committee no doubt are familiar with the changes that have taken place in the immigration regulations since we met the last time I will lay my up-to-date information and a few suggestions before this Committee without any lengthy introduction.

Canadian Immigration inspectional facilities are now available in the following European countries: United Kingdom, France, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Russia and Greece, and for displaced persons in the British and American occupation zones of Germany coming within the mandate of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. These facilities are expected to be available soon in Poland as well.

The Canadian diplomatic representatives in these countries have been delegated to handle the civil as well as the medical examination of applicants who desire to emigrate to Canada and it is most desirable that as soon as possible the newly established Canadian Legation in Stockholm, as well as other Canadian Legations, be staffed and equipped to do it. Prospective immigrants from countries where Canada has not as yet established diplomatic representation should be allowed to proceed to the nearest Canadian Legation or Consulate, whatever the case may be. In cases such as these, the prospective immigrant should of course have to secure a visa to enter the country where the examination is to take place as well as be in possession of some sort of a guarantee from the authorities of his country of origin allowing him to return, as he must have secured an exit permit to leave, in the event he would not be passed by the Canadian Authorities.

In addition to immigrants from the Scandinavian countries, United Kingdom and Finland, we are prepared to forward immigrants from the following countries



on the Continent of Europe: Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Holland, Hungary and Switzerland, in which countries general agencies have been established. Connections from these countries to Gothenburg, Sweden, the port of embarkation, are very good. A great number of people have been brought forward already from these countries on our ships. On one sailing, some time ago, we carried passengers of twenty one different nationalities.

A great number of applications for prospective immigrants from Europe have been filed by our Canadian Offices with the Immigration Authorities in Ottawa, which are waiting to be approved. A number of these applications are for displaced persons in Germany for whom the applicants are most anxious to prepay transportation via our Line without the aid of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. It is understood that this group of prospective immigrants is at present the main source from which new immigrants are admitted to this country.

The I.G.C.R. who is handling the selection and forwarding of these refugees from Germany, can count on our full co-operation.

I am not fully familiar with present transportation facilities in Germany but I understand the establishment of transportation routes is urgently needed. We are particularly interested in taking these prospective immigrants from Germany to Denmark, from where they will be forwarded to Sweden. This is a matter that may have to be carefully checked into by the Canadian Government, who in turn will have to get the co-operation of the American and British military authorities in their respective zones in Germany. If bus routes are not established by either the American or British authorities or the German Government, we then would like to secure permission to be able to send a bus from Denmark down to a central point in Germany, so that we could pick up the immigrants who had been investigated and passed by the Canadian Field Teams. It would be well if the Canadian Field Teams could establish a central point where immigrants could be assembled and then picked up by our bus. Prospective immigrants are now in camps all over Germany, where one might be picked out of one camp and one out of another, while it would be impossible to send one bus around to every one of these camps just to pick up a passenger. This requires a central point of congregation. At the present time we have established a bus route to Prague, Czechoslovakia, which is working out well and we could make the same arrangement for Germany.

Although our ships sail from Gothenburg, Sweden, direct to New York without calling at Halifax we are carrying a great number of passengers destined for various points in Canada. We are prepared to arrange westbound calls at Halifax if conditions warrant.

In closing I would like to mention this, that there is one type of single immigrant for which the demand is exceptionally great, i.e. domestic help, especially from Scandinavia and Finland. Shortage of this type of immigrant is particularly felt in the larger cities. We are swamped with inquiries from would-be employers regarding possibilities of bringing forward domestics.

I thank you.

Since this was written there are a couple more conditions I would like to lay before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Might I ask you a question about one of these paragraphs? You said, "Canadian immigration inspectional facilities are now available in the following European countries", and you mention Russia. What is the result of inspection there in Russia?

Mr. ROEBUCK: Where in Russia?

Mr. WASELIUS: In Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no possibility of immigrants coming from there?



Mr. WASELIUS: No. That is it. The other day I had a permit from the immigration authorities that we had to refuse. The man wrote in and said, "How much money do you want to cover the passage for three people?" I wrote back and said, "I hesitate to accept your money, because I know for sure that these people will not obtain their exit permits from Russia." I believe there were—

The CHAIRMAN: Russian wives—

Mr. WASELIUS: —a wife and a couple of children, if I remember aright.

The CHAIRMAN: —are not permitted to come?

Mr. WASELIUS: I saw an article in the paper not so long ago, to the effect that one of the former diplomatic representatives of Canada married a Russian lady, and she has been waiting in Russia for two years to get an exit permit.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And they won't give it.

Mr. WASELIUS: And they won't give it. After all, she is supposed to have a dual nationality.

The CHAIRMAN: So that that office in Russia is not worth anything?

Mr. WASELIUS: It is not worth anything, but I thought I would mention it, just the same.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: How are those facilities arranged in Moscow by the Canadian authorities?

Mr. WASELIUS: Of course, I would not know how it is arranged in Moscow now. Not so long ago I had word from Sweden that the Canadian Charge d'Affaires, Mr. Ford Palmer, had no instructions yet from the immigration authorities here as to how to go about it. He is getting it now—I hope so anyway.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me; I interrupted you when you were going to say something further.

Mr. WASELIUS: That is about the immigrants having to be examined in their own country. I may be wrong, but could not Canadian Immigration send their inspectors to these countries from the nearest convenient headquarters? I will not say they should do it for one immigrant, or for two. But let us say that a certain line, our own or some other line, would gather twenty-five or fifty people together at a certain point, in Hungary, for instance, which is still considered an enemy country. Why could they not, from Prague, where I understand Canada has established inspectional facilities, send a man down to Budapest? To Finland, Canada could maybe send somebody from Stockholm. I know for sure that Sweden would have no objection to giving visas for Finnish citizens to go to Stockholm and be examined, and the people anxious to come to Canada would have no objection to paying their fare to Stockholm, and maybe back again if they would not be accepted. Those people might have to get an exit permit for their respective countries, but at the same time—this is just a suggestion, of course—the endorsement could be made on this exit permit. "If not accepted by the Canadian authorities you are free to return to your native country".

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is all a matter of arrangement between our immigration officers in Europe and the various countries.

Mr. WASELIUS: That is what I thought. In the meantime, if the Canadian immigration authorities lose more time, we may lose a lot of good immigrants. I mean Canada now, not the Swedish American line.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You told us about the service that you were prepared to give and are in fact giving, the bus service, in bringing these immigrants to your ports on embarkation. You told us that your steamship company had a bus service to Czechoslovakia, to Prague.

Mr. WASELIUS: To Prague, yes. Of course the passengers have to pay their fare from Prague, but through arrangements by the Swedish American line a bus service has been established and it works wonderfully.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you got any others besides that?

Mr. WASELIUS: No, that is the only one.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But you are prepared to arrange a bus service?

Mr. WASELIUS: Prepared to arrange for Germany.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is a case of, "Whenever the government of Canada will receive them we will give you passengers"?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: How many vessels have you?

Mr. WASELIUS: Only two right now. We have space in May and June, so if the Canadian authorities would work fast in Germany we will be able to bring out some of these refugees. As I learned today, only 102 have been brought from there so far.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: 52.

Mr. WASELIUS: Mr. Randles said there are 50 more coming. So that is 102, which is not a very great number. So far as I understand we have had difficulties in getting these transportation routes arranged in Europe. With the co-operation of the Canadian authorities we may be able to do something.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How many does a bus carry?

Mr. WASELIUS: Now you have "got" me. What an ordinary bus carries.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: 40.

Mr. WASELIUS: I would say, between 40 and 50. Say 40.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are you prepared to send buses for groups of 40 or 50 people when the immigrants are passed and ready for your ship?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes. The only thing would be, I understand that Mr. Innes, in London, is the chief officer for the I.G.C.R.

The CHAIRMAN: If they were rejected by immigration inspection would you give them transportation back?

Mr. WASELIUS: No, we could not do that. They would have to pay that themselves. Would not all these be examined before? They are examined by the Canadian field teams in Germany.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We would have to give you notice that we have 50 ready to be carried from one point to another, in which case you are prepared to do the carrying.

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I understood from Mr. Joliffe, that they do have to assemble even these 52 in the one centre?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes. I have learned that since this was written.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: That is what Mr. Joliffe gave me to understand.

Mr. WASELIUS: That is the way it is worked, I understand. We have three places in Germany—Frankfurt, Hanover and a third one I forget now—where they assemble them. Hanover would not be too far from Denmark, for instance.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: But we have inspectional facilities in Prague now, have we not?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What vessels have you?

Mr. WASELIUS: We have two ships, the *Gripsholm* and the *Drottningholm*.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is the capacity of those vessels?

Mr. WASELIUS: Of immigrants? The *Gripsholm* takes about 750 immigrants. I do not say that we have space for 750 on each ship—by no means. We have space for a bus load, maybe, on each ship for the next two months. But every little bit helps this condition.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: They are on a regular route, of course.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What is the other one?

Mr. WASELIUS: The *Drottningholm*.

The CHAIRMAN: They are passenger boats?

Mr. WASELIUS: Passenger boats.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There is another boat coming into commission this spring, is there not?

Mr. WASELIUS: We are building her, but she will not be out before late in the fall.

The CHAIRMAN: Before when?

Mr. WASELIUS: November, I believe.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And these boats make their return trips every month, or three weeks?

Mr. WASELIUS: Every second week. We have a ship coming in every second week to New York, every second Friday, rather; no, Monday, I should say. Every second Monday the one leaves here, and on Friday the other leaves the other side. It takes ten days over. It is a bi-weekly service.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Did I understand you to tell us that with proper arrangements you can transport across the ocean fifty immigrants every two weeks?

Mr. WASELIUS: For May and June. But from the 15th of July, let us say, up to the 1st of November, I think we will not be able to do that, because the people who are visiting now will be returning around that time.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Could you start in again at the end of November?

Mr. WASELIUS: At the end of the year and the beginning of next year we would have space again.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: Is the government of Canada paying any subsidy or premium to companies who bring immigrants here?

Mr. WASELIUS: No.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: Was that not done in the past?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes, but we never handled business of that nature in the past.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: I am not speaking of your company; I am asking about the practice in general.

Mr. WASELIUS: Perhaps Mr. Randles could answer that.

Mr. RANGLES: That has not been done for thirty-five years, sir.

Mr. WASELIUS: And I have been in the business only twenty-five years.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In late years we have been trying to keep people out rather than to bring them in.

Mr. WASELIUS: Another thought that I have is about these former enemy countries. We have been notified in some cases that prospective immigrants are not admissible under the present law; and in other cases we are told that the applications are going to be investigated. If the application is from an Hungarian, for instance, the reply we get is, "We are sorry, but this cannot be dealt with because the prospective immigrant is of enemy nationality." This afternoon I might find out more about this, but at present I think that at least the

wives of men now here should be allowed to join their husbands, and that children under eighteen years whose parents are here should be allowed to join their parents. Maybe somebody knows whether that is permissible.

Mr. RANGLES: It is at the discretion of the Minister.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The Volks-Deutsch feel very badly that their relatives cannot come in.

Mr. WASELIUS: We take a chance that men whose families are not allowed to join them here may return to their own countries.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: What documents does your company require from an immigrant before he is accepted as a passenger on one of your ships?

Mr. WASELIUS: He has to have a permit from the immigration authorities, a valid passport, a visa to enter Canada, and visas for travelling through whatever countries he has to go through on the way.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: Is he required to exhibit a medical certificate?

Mr. WASELIUS: Of course, he would not get a visa unless he had been found medically fit.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: The permit to enter Canada covers that?

Mr. WASELIUS: Yes. The permit says that the immigrant has to be medically accepted or fit, whatever the wording is. I understand that in most cases, such as at Stockholm, Prague and so on, it is up to the Canadian diplomatic representatives to choose a reputable physician to examine prospective immigrants. I do not know how many Canadian doctors are over in Europe as yet; maybe there are none.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is a matter of internal management in the Immigration Branch.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? If not, I wish to thank you very much, Mr. Waselius, for appearing before us.

The committee adjourned until Wednesday, May 7, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.





Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada Immigration and Colonization  
Standing Committee, 1947  
(1947)

# (THE SENATE OF CANADA)



## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

# Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 6

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1947.

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

- Mr. H. C. P. Cresswell, Chief Commissioner, Department of Immigration and Colonization, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Mr. G. M. Hutt, Development Commissioner, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Mr. Frank W. Collins, Industrial Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
- Mr. Michael Garber, K.C., Montreal, Quebec, Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress.
- Mr. Saul Hayes, Montreal, Quebec, National Executive Director, Canadian Jewish Congress.

### APPENDIX

- A. Extract from *Foreign Trade* of February 22, 1947, on Refugee Industries in Canada.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY.  
1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine,	Donnelly,	McGeer,
Blais,	Dupuis,	Molloy,
Bouchard,	Euler,	Murdock,
Bourque,	Ferland,	Pirie,
Buchanan,	Haig,	Robertson,
Burchill,	Hardy,	Robinson,
Calder,	Horner,	Roebuck,
Campbell,	Hushion,	Taylor,
Crerar,	Lesage,	Vaillancourt,
Daigle,	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> ),	Veniot,
David,	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> ),	Wilson.

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, May 7, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators Murdock, *Chairman*, Burchill, Daigle, Ferland, Horner, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Roebuck, Taylor and Wilson—11.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Honourable Senator Roebuck was heard with respect to the recent action of the Government of Canada on immigration, and read into the record Order in Council P.C. 1734, dated 1st May, 1947, respecting the landing in Canada of immigrants, and statement on immigration by the Honourable J. A. Glen, Minister of Mines and Resources.

Mr. H. C. P. Cresswell, Chief Commissioner, Department of Immigration and Colonization, Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was heard and read a brief on the type of immigrants available for immigration into Canada and the shipping facilities for carrying prospective immigrants to Canada, and outlined the Company's past activities in the field of immigration and colonization.

Mr. Cresswell filed as an appendix to his brief a summary on Displaced Persons and a statement on Transfer of Capital.

Mr. G. M. Hutt, Development Commissioner, Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was heard and read a brief on the benefit to Canada of immigrants of certain types of technical and skilled industrial workers, and was questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Frank W. Collins, Industrial Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway Company, was heard and read a brief on the industrial development of Canada, and recommending admittance to Canada of a larger number of immigrants.

Mr. Michael Garber, K.C., Montreal, Quebec; Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress, was heard and read a brief by the Canadian Jewish Congress on Immigration to Canada of displaced persons of Europe, and recommending admittance to Canada of a larger number of Jewish displaced persons of Europe.

Mr. Saul Hayes, Montreal, Quebec, National Executive Director, Canadian Jewish Congress, was heard and questioned by Members of the Committee.

Mr. Hayes filed an extract from *Foreign Trade* of February 22, 1947, on Refugee Industries in Canada. (See Appendix "A".)

At 12.45 p.m., the Committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 8th May instant, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE

WEDNESDAY, May 7, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 11 a.m.

Hon. Mr. Murdock in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the first matter before us this morning.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Before we start I wish to make a little statement, if I have time to do so, by the way of opening. You will recall that at the meetings of this committee there was some question raised as to the futility or otherwise of our work in this committee. Some thought that we had spent a very great deal of time and that the results were meagre. Others took a different view. Now the question has been answered, and it has answered itself between the last meeting that this committee held and the present one in the announcement made by the Government of Canada in connection with the matter of immigration. The Prime Minister speaking in the House of Commons on Thursday last, May 1, announced a change in the Immigration Act, all regulations and Orders-in-Council, that is very sweeping and is in direct line and parallel to the recommendations of the Senate. These I think will meet with the approval of every member of this committee. I would like to put on the record the Order-in-Council that has been passed so that those, and they are numerous, who follow this record, will be able to learn what the picture is at the present moment. The standing Order-in-Council is P.C. 695. That has been altered a number of times in the last year, or slightly more than that, but on May 29 last there was a statement made by the Minister of Immigration as to the law in force at that time and certain additions were made. Now I am going to ask the reporters to put this into the records in the way I will supply it to them. On May 29 those admissible to Canada were,—

- (a) The wife or unmarried child under 18 years of age of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for his dependents.
- (b) The father or mother, the unmarried son or daughter eighteen years of age or over, the unmarried brother or sister, the orphan nephew or niece under sixteen years of age, of any person legally admitted to and resident in Canada, who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.
- (c) An agriculturist having sufficient means to farm in Canada.
- (d) The fiancée of any adult male legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive, marry and care for his intended wife.
- (e) A person who, having entered Canada as a non-immigrant, enlisted in the Canadian Armed Forces and, having served in such Forces, has been honourably discharged therefrom.

Now on January 30, 1947 by Order-in-Council P.C. 371 the following classes of admissibility were added.

1. The widowed daughter or sister (with or without unmarried children under 18 years of age) of a legal resident of Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives.



2. An agriculturist entering Canada to farm when destined to a father, father-in-law, son, son-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, uncle or nephew engaged in agriculture as his principal occupation who is in a position to receive such immigrant and establish him on a farm.
3. A farm labourer entering Canada to engage in assured farm employment.
4. A person experienced in mining, lumbering or logging entering Canada to engage in assured employment in any one of such industries.

That, with the standing Order at that time, which included a British subject or United States citizen coming to Canada and able to maintain themselves, was in substance the law at that time.

On Thursday last the Prime Minister announced an Order-in-Council, substituting for the first two paragraphs that I have just read the following clauses—I read by the way “wife and unmarried child under eighteen years of age, father or mother” and so on. Substituted for that is this—

The husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children if any; the father or mother; the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age; of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term “orphan” used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents.

I point out that added to those who were then admissible, is this phrase “together with husband or wife and unmarried children”. I call attention to the fact that there is no age limit with regard to the children—“the father or mother; the orphan nephew or niece under 21 years of age” which had previously been 18 and “of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives” and so on.

You will note that I have read the fiancée of the male adult legally admitted to and resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and will care for his intended wife and so on.

For that there has been substituted this clause:—

A person entering Canada for the purpose of marriage to a legal resident thereof; provided the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife.

I point out to you that for the previous “male adult” there has been substituted “a person entering Canada” which means that a man and a woman wishing to bring a fiancée or fiancé here for the purpose of marriage are placed in equal positions, provided, of course, that the husband, who is the natural breadwinner, is able to support his intended wife.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It is rather ambiguous.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I do not think it is.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What about the reverse.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: If the wife has earning ability, the husband would be able to maintain her and himself too at her expense. I do not think we are going to run into any difficulty on that. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my great pleasure with this action of the Government, which is in line with the recommendations which have been made and is probably influenced very considerably by the work of this committee. I think it is sound and humanitarian and I feel from the standpoint of Canada that it is the very best policy, both as a matter of domestic concern and in our foreign relations. I for one am deeply grateful to the Prime Minister who made this possible.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That only refers to residents in Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: It does not go any further than that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is as far as it goes but I think, as I have said so many times here and in the House, the best people who come are those who come here brought by relatives who are here and have already successfully established themselves.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: It does not attempt to solve the displaced persons problem at all.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Not insofar as the Order in Council is concerned, but it does to this extent that a good many of these displaced persons have relatives in Canada. I do not suppose anybody would criticize the bringing of these classes first. These are definitely entitled to an opportunity to priority.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I agree.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The Government has an added policy to admit in future a number of thousands—he did not specify how many thousands very wisely because that depends upon our ability to maintain them and a good deal depends on the ability of our officers, first in securing shipping and in admitting those immigrants whom they decide should first be admitted. The excuse of our officials that they are following the Government policy will no longer hold water. This cock will not fight any longer. They are to carry out a very reasonable immigration policy. I hope they will be able to get the shipping. I am not convinced that it can be done. Pardon me for all the time I have taken up.

The CHAIRMAN: Now I think we will hear from Mr. Cresswell.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I should point out for the record's sake that the representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway appeared before us last year and gave us a very great deal of most valuable information on our subject of immigration and our Steering Committee authorized me to invite them to appear again. May I express in advance our appreciation and gratitude for what they are doing for us. Mr. Cresswell is the Chief Commissioner of the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The CHAIRMAN: Alright, Mr. Cresswell, now you may proceed.

Mr. H. C. P. CRESSWELL, Chief Commissioner, Department of Immigration and Colonization, C.P.R.:—Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee: It was with pleasure that I received instructions from Mr. W. M. Neal, Chairman and President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to accede to your request that I should again appear before you in response to your further kind invitation. Mr. G. M. Hutt, Development Commissioner, and Mr. F. W. Collins, Industrial Manager, the other officers representing the Company are associated with me, as was the case last year, in presenting our Company's views; and we shall again, to the best of our ability, endeavour to answer such questions as honourable members of the Committee may desire to ask in regard to our respective departmental activities.

As honourable members of the committee know, immigration and colonization have continued to be the subjects of widespread interest and discussion during the past year. The published report of your committee attracted a great deal of attention and I trust that I may be permitted to add my own sincere congratulations to the many expressions of appreciation which I am sure, honourable senators must have received. Renewed interest in immigration has been displayed by various Canadian organizations, agricultural, industrial, business, social, religious and educational; and the most welcome decisions so far made by the Government with regard to further classes of admissible immigrants have met with general appreciation.

As honourable senators may recall, last year I described in some detail the organization of the Canadian Pacific Railway's Department of Immigration and

Colonization, its past activities, and its readiness and capacity to undertake new responsibilities with respect to future immigration. I ventured the opinion that history was repeating itself in respect of migration matters, the general pattern being very much the same as it was twenty-five years previously. The similarity lay in large numbers of people in the British Isles and on the Continent, just after a world war, looking to Canada for an opportunity to start life afresh in a country where, they believed, they—but more particularly their children—would be safer, and where opportunities are greater. There were, however, as I observed, some differences between the situation last July and that of twenty-five years previously, in that the number of people anxious to come to Canada was infinitely larger than it was a quarter of a century ago, while the need for people in Canada was being much more strongly and much more widely stressed. Since expressing those views I have paid an extended visit to Great Britain and the Continent, but before presenting a summary of the information I obtained during that visit, I should like to quote, with the kind indulgence of the committee, a brief paragraph from my remarks made here in July last:—

There are, undoubtedly, considerable numbers of people in Britain, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and other western countries who, providing international currency was stabilized, would have ample funds to establish themselves in this country without financial assistance of any kind, while the number of Displaced Persons in Europe of various nationalities runs into hundreds of thousands, a large percentage of whom would be capable of doing useful work in Canada if they were allowed to come, and means could be found to get them here.

The purpose of my visit overseas last fall was to determine, by personal survey, the actual migration potentialities, just where prospective immigrants were to be found, and the conditions and anticipated problems to be met. Amongst the latter, the shipping problem, of course, was uppermost in my mind. The visit included the renewal of contacts with officials of the United Kingdom Government, the governments of countries of Northwestern Europe, as well as organizations having to do with immigration and the resettlement of Displaced Persons. The countries visited were Great Britain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Holland, and the British and American Occupational Zones of Germany. It will not, of course, be possible for me in the time at my disposal to cover except very briefly the conditions pertaining to migration as I found them. However, for the convenience of the Committee, I have prepared, as an appendix to this brief, a memorandum relating to the circumstances affecting transfer of capital and also some figures regarding Displaced Persons.

Considerable numbers of the best type of immigrants for agricultural settlement in Canada are available in the British Isles. The quality of the prospective immigrants appeared to be excellent and the capital available greater, on the average, than before the war. In addition to the considerable number of agricultural families with capital in prospect, there are farm workers and other intending migrants within a wide range of trades and callings, together with teen-aged boys for agricultural training and juveniles of both sexes for voluntary society upbringing. Notwithstanding that other countries of the British Commonwealth have stimulated a great deal of interest, there is no doubt whatever that Canada occupies a special place in the minds of those British people who are seeking opportunities in overseas countries.

According to a Canadian Press report of less than three weeks ago, Viscount Addison, Dominions Secretary, stated in the House of Lords that the government stands "all-out" for immigration to the Dominions and colonies as far as the domestic manpower situation and shipping facilities would permit. It was further stated that the Dominions had agreed not to accept as immigrants



men who are liable to military service in the United Kingdom and that the British Government had carried out detailed discussions with all the Dominions to speed up immigration and was investigating the possibility of new settlements in British Guiana and British Honduras.

As to transfer of capital, an emigrant from the British Isles to a dollar country is allowed to draw from his assets up to £5,000 (\$20,000) in equal annual instalments of £1,250 for the first four years. If his total assets are less than £2,000 (\$8,000) he can transfer it at the rate of £500 (\$2,000) each year. Emigrants to British Commonwealth countries outside the dollar area, however, can take *unlimited* capital. This, of course, gives South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and other countries within the Sterling area a decided advantage.

With regard to the European Continent, prospects for future Canadian settlers seem best in Switzerland, Holland and Belgium. There is keen interest in the Dominion amongst the Swiss, and Canada should receive many experienced agricultural families with capital, as well as other industrious people when it is possible for them to come. While there are a considerable number of agricultural families in Holland who would like to settle in Canada, it is not possible for them to do so just now owing to the prohibition on export of capital. But there are thousands of farmers' sons who have little or no chance of obtaining farms of their own in Holland due to damage caused by the war and other changes brought about by that conflict. These farmers' sons would eagerly grasp the opportunity of undertaking farm work in Canada in the hope of owning their own farms. As far as Belgium is concerned, the immediate prospects of migration to Canada are good, but export of capital for the emigrant is controlled. It might well be, however, that when shipping becomes more freely available, even greater relaxation of those regulations might be in evidence so far as agricultural families are concerned. Apart from this, there are no official obstacles to emigration from that country.

In France, there is more interest in immigration into that country than emigration, but in any case, there has been little immigration into Canada from that source during the past 100 years. While there is no restriction on emigration, capital export is very limited—in any event, there is little likelihood that France can be an important source of immigration into Canada for some time to come.

Relative to Canada's population needs, the Scandinavian countries are not likely to be a source of any large number of the fine type of settlers the people from those countries have proved to be in years gone by. Here again, however, actually the numbers coming to Canada between the two world wars were not great. It is generally a popular thought that Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have a greater population than is actually the case but their total combined population is only about that of Canada. As far as Denmark is concerned, there is no official restriction against emigration from that country other than monetary, and it is highly probable that special consideration would be given in the cases of intending migrants. In Norway, with capital export strictly controlled and a marked labour shortage, emigration is discouraged. This is true also of Sweden. However, it might be noted that in each of these countries there are actually a great many enquiries from interested people and other persons anxious to join friends, relatives and fiancées in this country.

As is the case with France, there is a greater interest in immigration than emigration on the part of the authorities in Czechoslovakia. This is due to the acute shortage of labour and scarcity of foreign exchange, but it may be that later on it will be possible to secure the type of people from that country whose agricultural background and industriousness made them so adaptable in the building up of farms in this country in previous years.

The Canadian Pacific is, of course, very much interested in the problem of the Displaced Persons and while overseas I visited some of the camps on the Continent. The Appendix to which I have previously referred contains a good



deal of detailed information with regard to the large number of registered Displaced Persons. The matter is one which comes under the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees and, of course, the United Nations Organization. In addition to the registered Displaced Persons, there are hundreds of thousands of other refugees of various nationalitiés, not only within the occupied zones of Germany but also in Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland and other countries, who do not, at present, seem to come within the scope of the international refugee bodies but of these very many have close relatives and friends in Canada who are prepared to assist in their immigration to, and settlement in, the Dominion.

Having thus ascertained what the prospects were with regard to people desiring to migrate, the concern of the Company with regard to shipping facilities, was, naturally, even more urgent. Without taking up the time of the Committee by going unnecessarily into details of the persistent and I may say, exhaustive, exploration of all known possibilities of this phase of the migration problem, it was finally clear that the solution lay in one direction only, namely, that ships could be obtained only as the result of negotiations between governments.

In the exhaustive efforts made by the Canadian Pacific to find available vessels, the great shortage of passenger ships in the world today, due to war losses, was clearly demonstrated and none of these have been made good since the end of hostilities. It was also learned that at present in the United States no suitable war-built ships are available for sale or charter to non-citizens of the United States. Even if any such ships were available for charter, they would not be permitted, in their present condition, to carry passengers in commercial service under private operation. With few exceptions, all Liberty and Victory types of U.S. ships which were, and are being used as troopships are really cargo ships with berths fitted on board for the carriage of troops. They do not comply with the regulations governing sub-division of compartments, fire defence appliances and life saving appliances for passenger vessels. Such vessels could, therefore, only be operated on Government account and would not be permitted to carry passengers in commercial service for private owners. As a matter of fact, enquiries were made by the Canadian Pacific to ascertain if any pre-war U.S. passenger vessels were available for charter, but without success. Enquiries were also made amongst the Scandinavian countries, with the same result.

As an instance of the situation brought about by the war, it is understood that there are about 50 passenger liners of British registry, each of over 20,000 tons, for which reconversion plans have not yet been definitely made and which are now being operated on account of the British Ministry of Transport as troopships. None of these vessels have so far been permitted to operate in commercial service under private ownership, and will not be, until they have been reconverted, surveyed by Lloyds and furnished with passenger and safety certificates. Troopships could be used for the carrying of immigrants and refugees or displaced persons but only by arrangement between the governments concerned, whereby the requirements of the Safety of Life at Sea Convention would be waived for emergency purposes.

The significance of the foregoing situation as it applies to Canada is readily apparent when one thinks of the great number of immigrants which might have been admitted this year had shipping been available. As a result of recent amendments to orders in council, the latest of which was P.C. 371, as amended by P.C. 1734 announced last week, it is obvious that compared with the large number of immigrants which could now be admitted there will be a very great deficit. With the shipping presently in sight it is not considered possible to move more than 25,000 this year. On the other hand, I do not hold the view that because of the regrettable shortage of shipping new measures such as those recently announced are in any way premature. It takes considerable time for such new measures to become really effective.

I have referred previously to recent statements by the Dominions Secretary, Viscount Addison. Another of his announcements, as reported in the press, was that agreements had been reached with Australia and South Africa for making available a number of troopships which will take 6,900 Britons to Australia and an unestimated number to South Africa this year. Next year, the report said, immigration to Australia would be doubled. While I have referred to this chiefly to point out the fact that this arrangement with respect to steamships was an arrangement between governments, it might be perhaps well also to recall that the week before last the Australian Minister of Immigration, in a personal broadcast which was carried on the Dominion-wide network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, said that Australia was looking forward to receiving many thousands of people from Great Britain, the United States, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Holland and other favourable sources. Plans for future movements to Australia were described as being the greatest in Australian history, priority being based on Australia's economic production. The Minister concluded with the statement that the migrants referred to would be coming to Australia "in response to our invitation to link their fate with our destiny."

One of the outstanding points stressed by the report of your Committee last year was the fact that immigration is a long-term matter. That is something which should, of course, be borne in mind constantly by everyone who has the future of this country at heart. It is perhaps natural that such great difficulties as have been encountered during the past year in the effort to meet immediate needs should tend to obscure the requirements for the future. As honourable members of the Committee know, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company commenced its colonization work as soon as the construction of the railway started at the beginning of the 1880's. That was a time when the United States was attracting large numbers of people to the Middle West; and so the Canadian Pacific lost no time in drawing the attention of prospective settlers in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe to Canada's potentialities. No doubt it is difficult for successive generations to realize that the Company's interest in immigration and colonization is not a matter of selling steamship and railway tickets, but is, as we have so frequently pointed out, an interest in the progress of the country, through immigration and the successful settlement of people in suitable areas throughout the country. The freight train is the symbol of that success and of that necessity. It is also a reminder that immigration and colonization always was, is now, and always will be, a long-term effort no matter how pressing monetary needs may be. That means no let-up in the steady recognition of the fact that maintenance of employment, and increased employment, in Canada, depend on the continued production, and increased production of natural resources. That means expanding industries, new industries, new capital, new labour. A recent report by a sociologist of the City College of New York who recently completed a study of the economic effects of immigration in the United States says: "Fears among Americans that immigration tends to displace native workers from their jobs and create unemployment are not supported by scientific evidence." Such displacement as did take place, he found, was an upward displacement. The immigrants gave native workers and older immigrants an opportunity to move up with better paid work and supervisory positions. We can see that this has also been true of Canada; and surely it is most patently true at the present time. If Canada only had all the labour it needed both in primary and secondary industries to-day, who can doubt that there would be far more higher-paid opportunities.

Members of the Committee will recall that last year I ventured to say that the possibilities of providing opportunities for newcomers to establish themselves in Canada were never greater than they were at that time. Since then it has become abundantly clear that the same situation prevails to-day. You will know of the shortage of general farm labour and of the statements made by

officials of the beet sugar industry regarding the shortage in the beet sugar fields. Statements have also frequently appeared since I was last before you with regard to the opportunities in other basic industries which can easily absorb more people. The needed workers apparently cannot be found in Canada and it is obvious that unless they are brought from elsewhere some of our most valuable industries will undoubtedly continue to suffer for lack of raw materials. I recall very clearly the statement of the Chairman of the Canadian Congress of Mining only a few months ago that one of the most desperate needs in the Canadian mining industry was manpower. That the foregoing needs have been recognized is shown by the recent decision to permit the entry to Canada of sugar beet and other workers and also by the passing of Order in Council P.C. 371 with regard to the mining, lumbering and logging industries. Obviously, as the Canadian natural resources are brought more fully into use, more opportunities for employment are created and the wealth of the country correspondingly increased. The building of homes, factories and other work in the building trades has continued to be delayed largely because it has not been possible to ensure the production of raw materials required, so it is quite clear that larger numbers of people can be employed at work which is now even more urgent and necessary to Canada's future development. Such people would cause greater opportunities for settlement to be opened up on the land, thus providing employment for many thousands more. No apprehension as to the ability of the country to absorb large numbers of people need be felt if full use is made of the knowledge of the problems involved in the migration of people and their settlement in Canada gained from the experience of past years.

Honourable members of the Senate Committee, again I thank you for the opportunity that you have given me to be here to-day. I feel certain that my associates, Mr. Collins and Mr. Hutt, will join with me in saying that in years to come the work that your Committee did last year, and is doing this year, will be regarded by succeeding beneficiaries of Canada's enormous productive potential, as a definite signpost to the Dominion's great future.

### DISPLACED PERSONS

The following is a summary of the Displaced Persons who, towards the end of last year, were receiving UNRRA assistance in the British, United States and French Zones of Germany and in Austria and Italy. (This does not include the hundreds of thousands of other Displaced Persons who are not registered).

	<i>Total Registered</i>	<i>Agriculturists</i>	<i>Per cent Agriculturists</i>
Germany:			
British Zone .....	132,647		
U.S. Zone .....	192,296		
French Zone .....	20,338		
	<hr/> 345,281	81,992	23.74
Austria .....	26,535	5,992	22.58
Italy .....	15,035	2,003	13.32
	<hr/> Total .....	<hr/> 89,987	<hr/> 23.26
	<hr/> Males .....	<hr/> 61,768	<hr/> 25.60
	<hr/> Females .....	<hr/> 28,219	<hr/> 19.39
	<hr/> 386,851	<hr/> 89,987	<hr/> 23.26



## NATIONALITIES

	<i>Total Registered</i>	<i>Agriculturists</i>	<i>Per cent Agriculturists</i>
Polish .....	163,300	52,284	32.02
Russian .....	4,107	551	13.42
Ukrainian .....	41,949	13,324	31.71
Baltic .....	88,500	13,608	15.38
Yugoslav .....	16,904	3,985	25.57
Czech .....	1,205	217	18.00
Jewish .....	45,797	2,359	5.15
Greek .....	344	15	3.78
Stateless .....	7,124	941	13.21
Austrian .....	628	15	2.39
Ex-Enemy .....	4,353	2,717	16.47
Miscellaneous .....	12,640	1,973	15.61
Total .....	386,851	89,987	23.26

## TRANSFER OF CAPITAL

With regard to Great Britain, the Bank of England officially permits the exportation by intending emigrants to dollar countries of a maximum of £5,000 in four equal annual instalments of £1,250, but in certain instances and special circumstances, the Bank has been known to be even more liberal in its monetary transfer authorization—even to the extent of allowing the immediate purchase of dollars up to one half of the maximum of £5,000. In cases where the emigrant's total assets are less than £2,000 capital can be transferred at the rate of £500 each year. Emigrants to British Commonwealth countries outside the dollar area, however, can now take unlimited capital. This, of course, gives South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and other countries within the Sterling area a decided advantage.

As mentioned in the foregoing brief, there would be no obstacles put in the way of emigration from Denmark by the Government of that country other than monetary control; and insofar as export of capital is concerned, each case of an intending emigrant would be considered on its merits by the National Bank.

As far as Norway is concerned, export of capital is strictly prohibited.

In Sweden, if emigrants, including the refugees from the Baltic countries could obtain permission to leave, they would probably be allowed to take with them their capital even though export of funds is strictly controlled. I should mention in passing, however, that Swedish capital is taking an interest in Canada and, in general, is looking for foreign investments.

In Switzerland there are no restrictions on the transfer of capital.

In France, export is limited to \$300.

In Belgium, while the export of capital is controlled at present, it is understood that each case is considered on its merits. Generally speaking, the amount permitted for each adult seems to be \$1,000 and \$500 per child.

Exportation of capital from Holland is prohibited and this precludes immediate emigration of the large number of agricultural families mentioned in the brief, unless some arrangement for the provision of dollar capital for settlement purposes in Canada could be evolved against deposit of Dutch guilders in Holland.

Czechoslovakia—export of capital is strictly prohibited. Foreign exchange is scarce.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a very fine statement, Mr. Cresswell, and I am sure it will be of interest to many thousands of Canadians.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is packed full of interesting information.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And much of it is on personal knowledge. I join with the Chairman, sir, in thanking you for this co-operation.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is a splendid paper.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions that any members of the committee would like to ask Mr. Cresswell before we proceed?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have a very full program.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I had a question I thought of while you were reading but I have forgotten what it is. I may run across it before you leave.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The statement is so plain that it does not require much elaboration. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hutt the Development Commissioner of the C.P.R. is present.

The CHAIRMAN: Alright, Mr. Hutt.

Mr. G. M. HUTT: Mr. Chairman and honourable members. When I had the privilege of appearing before you on July 2, 1946, I spoke from the standpoint of one whose intimate contacts are almost exclusively with producers of Canadian raw materials. Stress was laid on the thought that our primary industries would benefit by the immigration of at least certain types of technical and skilled industrial workers and of industrialists with investment capital.

I wish now to re-affirm my original statement. Indeed I have become convinced during the past year that there is much more room in industry for labour than originally I had thought.

Recently I have been going through the annual reports for 1946 of many Canadian mining companies. In statement after statement through these there appears some reference to labour shortage during the year. I quote from a few of them:—

The productive capacity of the Mine has been greatly reduced by the continued shortage of labour, as men have been leaving the Mines for more lucrative work in other lines of industry.

O'Brien Gold Mines, Limited—Kewagama, Que.—Year 1946.

Shortage of labour has restricted all types of development for some years; development is far behind. . . .

McKenzie Red Lake Gold Mines, Limited—McKenzie Island, Ont.—Year 1946.

The labour supply improved early in the year, but dropped to the lowest point yet experienced during the summer months. The end of the year showed a seasonal improvement of the available supply.

Sigma Mines (Quebec) Limited—Bourlamaque, Que.—Year 1946.

The scarcity of miners which was general throughout Canada was particularly acute in Western Quebec. At the beginning of the year our working force was 1,420 as compared to the pre-war normal force of 1,800. The number of employees declined steadily during the year and reached a low of 1,147 at the end of October, with the result that the average tonnage of ore hoisted per day worked in 1946 was 20 per cent less than in 1945.

Noranda Mines, Limited—Noranda, Que.—Year 1946.

The labour situation during the first half of the year was very serious. However, during the latter portion of the fiscal period there was a pronounced improvement.

Belleterre Quebec Mines Limited—Belleterre, Que.—Year 1946.

There was a serious shortage of underground labour throughout the year, especially during the spring and summer.

Sullivan Consolidated Mines Limited—Sullivan, Que.—Year 1946.

Miners are not returning to the industry.

Howe Sound Company—Britannia Beach, B.C.—Year 1946.

During the year your Company, in common with other mines, was handicapped through the lack of experienced labour. . . . Underground exploration will be expanded as labour conditions permit.

Central Patricia Gold Mines Limited—Central Patricia, Ont.—Year 1946.

Labour supply continued to improve throughout the year, and all classes became available in sufficient numbers except skilled miners and certain types of tradesmen.

The Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada Ltd.—Tadanac, Warfield, etc.

A number of adverse factors also developed or continued during 1946, including . . . . . a shortage of experienced men.

The manpower situation in 1946 showed a slight improvement over the previous year but still was far below the pre-war years. The average number of shifts worked per day underground was 182 as compared with 314 in 1939.

Bralorne Mines Limited—Bridge River District, B.C.—Year 1946.

I also wish to quote the following remarks made by Mr. J. Y. Murdoch, President of Noranda Mines, Limited, in his address to shareholders delivered at the Annual Meeting of that Company in Toronto, April 25, 1947:

The basic factor in all our operations is an adequate supply of labour. This is a matter of deep concern to the entire mining industry which is in a position to offer steady employment at good wages to thousands of men. Due to the war and other causes, Canada's population has not kept pace with her industrial expansion and if we are to take advantage of our opportunities, selected immigration is an urgent necessity.

It is evident that in this field of development there is a shortage of many types of labour, skilled and unskilled. The same condition prevails among many others of our primary industries. Since the war I have assisted a very considerable number of young men released from the armed services or war industries in finding new employment. There is undoubtedly a general disinclination among our native born men to accept employment that requires locating in very small communities such as is usually the case in the mining and forest industries. It is evident that Canadian industry can absorb a very substantial immigration of workers of all kinds.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask you, Mr. Hutt, about the statement "miners are not returning to the industry." Would you be able to give us an indication as to why?

Mr. HUTT: To be perfectly frank the average man never did like to work underground and a great number of young men, particularly those who during the war married and had children or had children before the war and moved their families into the cities, have decided they like the schooling and other facilities of the larger centres. In fact their wives do not want them to go back to the smaller communities. That is one good reason. I do not know that it is the most important.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The remuneration counting everything in in the cities is greater than in the mining industry.

Mr. HUTT: I do not mean the financial situation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I said counting everything in.

Mr. HUTT: Yes. All the facilities in the cities are very much appreciated by the families of these men. I could go as high as the professional levels in the industry, the geologists and so on.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The mining centres in some instances are so much superior to the surrounding country. Timmins is very well equipped. I was surprised to find out how well.

Mr. HUTT: They are not all like that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Does that remark apply to the lumbering industry, as well as to the mining industry?

Mr. HUTT: I should think it was more temporary.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Does it not apply to agriculture?

Mr. HUTT: I am not so familiar with agriculture.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There are the wonderful facilities for education and for happy enjoyment of well-equipped houses and so on. It is so great that perhaps these industries have got to move up in their remuneration which they offer to those who take part.

Mr. HUTT: Yes, but to be fair to the mining companies, I must say that they have established very ample facilities as rapidly as they can. Most of these mining communities have been quite small ones. If they are at all permanent they have very good facilities indeed and still people like to come into the cities.

The CHAIRMAN: Except that most of the miners are removed from their homes and families in many cases.

Mr. HUTT: That is true right now.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The lumbering industry has made very little arrangements for families.

Mr. HUTT: That is true.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The bunk house day has gone by.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: They are in a different position in this part of the world because it is altogether seasonal.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Thank you, Mr. Hutt. We can discuss this for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Collins, Industrial Manager, is here as part of the delegation from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The CHAIRMAN: Alright, Mr. Collins.

Mr. F. W. COLLINS: Honourable Mr. Murdock and Honourable Senators:—

I am again honoured in having the opportunity of presenting, with my confreres, Mr. Cresswell and Mr. Hutt, a brief outlining our views on the very vital and important subject of immigration in relation particularly to our country's continued growth and enlargement.

As Industrial Manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am charged with the industrial phase of our company's activities. At the hearings of this committee last year I discussed several aspects of the industrial growth of our country as it pertains to national development. I was very deeply impressed by the extent of the knowledge which your committee displayed in the changing industrial scene of our country and by your warm and sincere interest in evolving a constructive approach to one of Canada's great problems—that of population and the most logical method of its rapid solution.

On my last appearance before this honourable committee I gave a general outline of our industrial development. I stressed the prominent position that our country has attained as an industrial nation and the responsibilities which this



growth has imposed upon our people in the formulation of the policies which are necessary to maintain and to expand it.

You will be gratified in knowing that our industrial expansion continues on a high level and that there is no immediate sign of any change in the trend towards an enlarged and diversified industrial economy. A striking commentary of our virility is the achievement reported in the 1946 annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway that 665 manufacturing, warehousing and distributing industries established or expanded their activities along the far flung lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A total of 34·7 track miles of railway sidings were constructed for the use of 242 of these industries.

A definite indication of our expanding industrial economy may be observed by those travelling over Canadian Pacific lines on the north shore of Lake Superior. In this area where, a short time ago, the primeval wilderness held undisputed sway, extensive plants have been constructed for the production of chemical pulps. New towns, known as Marathon and Terrace Bay, have come into being in the province of Ontario. These communities and their plants, served exclusively by the Canadian Pacific Railway, are definite and important factors in Canada's ever-widening industrial horizon.

Canada today is regarded as a land of destiny—young, endowed with vast riches largely awaiting development and at the commencement of its major economic growth. It is rightly held to be one of the last great industrial frontiers of the world. Thoughtful people in this country, the United States and elsewhere are aware of Canada's strategic position for distributing purposes and of the many advantages it possesses as a manufacturing base. Its agricultural and its mineral wealth are practically unlimited. These facts have led to a new period in our economic development. The best proof of the universal belief in Canada's future is the manner in which our large war-time plant capacity, under the skillful direction of the War Assets Corporation, has been for the most part already absorbed in peace-time manufacturing activities. Several of our large war-plant installations have been employed as multiple tenancy operations and all are fully occupied. A welcome revival is the introduction to our country of several large British firms which have either acquired war-time plants or are arranging new construction. These firms will make a valuable addition to our economy.

Canada is now being investigated by business men from Great Britain, the European Continent, South America, the United States and other lands. They are cognizant of the possibilities of wealth and opportunity inherent to our general economy. The indications are that our industrial growth will continue and that all Canadians will share in its advantages providing the required steps are taken to balance our forward march. As in the past we still have one major problem and that is we must have a large population to develop adequately and within a reasonable time, the wealth which awaits the co-operation and the work of men. There are only two ways in which population may be secured—one is by natural growth within the country and the other is by immigration. The first method is slow and I suggest that the second course is the only one which, under proper supervision, will provide our country with the human impetus it requires. After all, intelligent, active people make countries and provide the wealth and the creative opportunities not only for themselves but for all their fellow citizens who are prepared to do their share in extending the frontiers. I realize full well that there are many objections to immigration, such as a lack of sufficient housing accommodation. May I remind you that when our ancestors came to these shores, there was a very decided lack of housing facilities. In fact there was a complete dearth of practically everything which was required for even very simple living. But were our ancestors, who built this country with the sweat of their hands and back-breaking labour, down-hearted? They were not. They stayed here and they worked from dawn to



dusk with all their strength, all their perseverance and all their devotion which, in many cases, were their only assets. They created their own homes, in addition to clearing the land and opening the country. Today, throughout Canada, you will find many instances of this same pioneer spirit. Brave people will not be stopped or hindered by obstacles but through courage and determination will use those same obstacles as stepping stones to opportunity and personal security.

In the world today there are many hundreds of thousands of brave and courageous people desiring of transferring their activities to this Western World. Their settling here would guarantee our country's well-rounded and balanced progress and prosperity and would, as in the past, create enlarging opportunities for our people. The only worth-while growth in this world has its roots in active, intelligent and industrious human beings, prepared to work in the development of a democratic society. Every other asset we have is dependent upon this human factor. The time is now opportune to capitalize upon world conditions to the end that Canada may secure a virile accretion to its population.

Canada needs a population two to three times its present size and needs that population as soon as possible, otherwise Canada can never maintain any important position among the nations of the world corresponding to its industrial growth. Canada's industrial capacity is now largely geared to the export trade. If that export trade should for any reason diminish substantially then Canada would suffer financially, industrially and commercially. A large population would ensure the self-sufficiency of our country and immigration is the only answer to that problem.

Mr. Chairman, your committee is serving a useful national purpose in presenting these basic truths to our country. Your hearings provide a medium for the expression of representative thought on the subject of immigration which, I trust, will result in the formulation of a policy allowing an inflow of people prepared to co-operate with our citizens in realizing the future we all desire for our country.

The CHAIRMAN: Another very fine presentation, I should say.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously impressed with the magnificent presentations that we have heard not only from the present but the two preceding speakers. Their statements are crammed full of the information we desire. I may also point out something as to the literary excellence of these statements, particularly with the last one. I am particularly grateful. We have a little time for discussion of these papers.

The CHAIRMAN: I can recall the time when as an old railroad man, I did not think railway officials had that much humanity in them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They present the view of true Canadianism and the very best Canadianism.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Up to the present time the papers we have listened to—does it amount to this—that we need, as we all admit and contend, a larger immigration but can we get that? Can we bring them over here?

The CHAIRMAN: We are shy of shipping.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: That's what I understand from Mr. Cresswell. No matter what the situation may be or how anxious we are, we cannot get the shipping.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But Mr. Cresswell pointed out that we could look into getting Governmental co-operation. He pointed out that private interests were unable to meet the demand for shipping, but he did say that it was not impossible for us to arrange with the Shipping Board in England for an assignment of shipping to our interests. I feel we have not been persistent enough or perhaps have not been treated very generously by that Board. We have a ship that has been

used before the *Aquitania*. If that ship was given to us for immigration purposes, that problem would be solved.

Mr. CRESSWELL: It is understood that one ship will continue to the end of September.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Not serving Canada only.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Has it not been carrying large numbers of people to New York?

Mr. CRESSWELL: No, it has been arranged to take them to Halifax until the end of September. That is confirmed. That arrangement will be effective up to the end of September. In other words it will give about another five voyages of the *Aquitania* after the end of June; there will be two in July; two in August and one in September.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How many does that ship carry?

Mr. CRESSWELL: Around 1200. That will give us about 10,000 additional.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You included in your statement, Mr. Cresswell the moving of 25,000 people here.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That includes what you have now told us?

Mr. CRESSWELL: Yes. I think the figures stated before the committee by Mr. Jolliffe were something less than 15,000 and I increased Mr. Jolliffe's figures by another 10,000 in view of the fact that the *Aquitania* is now available.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: 25,000 is not to be brushed aside lightly.

Mr. CRESSWELL: No, but it is much smaller than we brought last year.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How many last year?

Mr. CRESSWELL: That included dependents. That included about 75,000.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: If the *Aquitania* is used is she to sail from the Continent or British ports?

Mr. CRESSWELL: From British ports, but it will include some displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: If we could carry 75,000 last year, why cannot we do the same this year.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Because the ships are not available. The Government provided the ships with No. 1 priority. This year the ships are not available.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What are they being used for?

Mr. CRESSWELL: Take the *Empress of Australia* which was on the North Atlantic run but is now being used outside of it.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Have you taken into consideration this, Mr. Chairman, that we shipped out of the country men that the farmers were anxious to keep. They were taken out.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Yes, but as I tried to emphasize it is a matter of arrangement between the Government providing the company, such as the C.P.R. cannot provide ships for present service.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: When there is an intergovernmental desire to send shipping this way, such as for instance the Poles, they seem to have no difficulty at all.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It annoys me. I do not think it has been the British custom to continue ever after a war is over to speak of people as enemy aliens. We talk of displaced persons and our opportunity in this country to secure immigrants who are likely to make a success of themselves in this country. There are perhaps more displaced Germans than there are any other Europeans

who are suitable for mining and lumbering work in this country but any time we bring up the question they are just enemy aliens. I feel like saying how long are we going to continue that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That might also apply to Italians and Romanians and so on.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I would like to have some of the beet growers on this committee. I am told by men from Lethbridge that they would prefer one German working for them to ten of these Poles in the beet fields.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I wouldn't like to admit any distinction between these people. The Polish boys are acting very well. I do not think we should pass that.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The people who have been made the victims should be given the preference to the others. There is an enormous number of victims displaced recently who have no chance and there would be an outcry if we gave preference to the prisoners of war.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I do not say preference but we should give them some chance where they are on the land now.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: Would there be any figures available on people who were transported last year by air?

Mr. CRESSWELL: I don't think the number of displaced persons transported by air was very large.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: There were quite a few immigrants.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, but I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the committee might be interested in getting a little further information from Mr. Collins on this question. He says "a welcome revival is the introduction to our country of several large British firms which have either acquired wartime plants or are arranging new construction. These firms will make a valuable addition to our economy." Could you give us a list of those firms, Mr. Collins?

Mr. COLLINS: During the last few months there has been considerable activity on the part of the British industrialists wishing to establish in Canada. At Cap de la Madeleine, P.Q., opposite Three Rivers, a plant has been acquired by the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Zinc Oxide Co. Ltd., a Canadian subsidiary has been incorporated called the Durham Chemicals Canada Ltd. This will provide a large measure of employment to citizens of that territory.

At Buckingham, P.Q., the Lacrinoid Products of London, England have been incorporated in Canada as part of the Plastics development.

Another interesting activity is Lines Bros. Limited of Merton, England. These people are one of the largest toy manufacturers in Great Britain. They produce a full range of toys, including juvenile bicycles and tricycles, plastic aircraft and other plastic toys. They have purchased the Canadian Power Boat plant which was operated during the war on Cote St. Paul, Montreal. That will be known as Lines Brothers Canada Limited. Another large development is that of Turner & Newall who were originally at Washington, which by the way is the birth place of George Washington, in the County of Durham, England who have purchased property in the City of Montreal and are presently engaged in the erection of a plant which will involve an expenditure of several millions of dollars. They will produce asbestos products. That is also an associate of the Bell Asbestos Mines, located at Thetford Mines, P.Q. Another concern called Atlas Asbestos Limited in Montreal is also represented. That will all be a very welcome addition to our manufacturing activities.

In addition to that the Wolsey Company of Leicester are locating in the St. Malo shops in Quebec City and will manufacture their well-known line of socks.

That is briefly an outline of what I referred to.



Hon. Mrs. WILSON: How are they securing their capital?

Mr. COLLINS: Those arrangements they have been able to make themselves.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: These people bring some of their experienced help with them.

Mr. COLLINS: Naturally they have to bring supervisory help to originate these developments which are to benefit everyone in the country.

The CHAIRMAN: I noted with interest that most of these concerns you are referring to are locating in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. COLLINS: At the present time those I have mentioned are locating in the Province of Quebec, but there will be other activities also. It is only in its infancy and people are engaged in making inquiries throughout Canada. I just selected these.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The time we have allotted to this particular subject is past.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you Mr. Collins, to your two colleagues Mr. Hutt and Mr. Cresswell.

Mr. COLLINS: May I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before your committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have representatives with us of the Jewish Congress, Mr. Michael Garber, K.C., of Montreal, one of the national vice presidents of the Congress and Mr. Monroe Abbey of Montreal, Mr. Joseph Fine of Montreal and Mr. Sol Kanee of Winnipeg, officers of the Congress, also Mr. Saul Hayes of Montreal, National Director of the Congress and Mr. Jerry Segall of Montreal. There will be only two who are spokesmen. Mr. Garber will lead the spokesmen.

The CHAIRMAN: As chairman may I say that I was somewhat surprised, and in a measure highly indignant, to have handed to me by one of the members of the committee, a report from the *Montreal Gazette* of what was going to be stated here this morning by Mr. Garber. I thought it was somewhat premature and rather ill-advised. Maybe Mr. Garber would have some explanation to give of why the press of Canada got it before we did.

Mr. MICHAEL GARBER: Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee. I am sorry I have to open the proceedings of the Congress with an unqualified apology for this matter that has appeared in the *Montreal Gazette*. All I can say in extenuation is that it was the work of an over-zealous employee of the Congress who apparently was not aware of the proprieties involved. It was done without the knowledge of his superior officer and certainly without the knowledge of the delegation. As a matter of fact we only read it in the *Gazette* ourselves and we are indeed sorry about it.

The CHAIRMAN: We will forgive you and hear what you have to say now.

Mr. GARBER: I first want to bring greetings from our President, Mr. Samuel Bronfman and express the delight of the delegation to have an opportunity of listening to the previous briefs this morning. We did not feel that any corporation could be so full of eloquence as was expressed in the three addresses given here.

The Canadian Jewish Congress expresses its thanks to the Senate Committee on Immigration and Labour on behalf of the community of Canadian Jews for the opportunity of appearing before it to make known its views on what is surely one of the major problems to which the people of Canada must address themselves.



May we also use a moment or two of the time allotted to us to enter a tribute to the Senate of Canada for the reconvening of this important committee and to the committee itself for the splendid service it gave last summer and continues to give in the creation of a national forum for the expression of a public opinion on matters of special consequences. Under these official auspices of Parliament such an inquiry is of extraordinary usefulness. Objectively, soberly, and with a desire to obtain the facts, this subcommittee has sat and now sits again to amass information, enabling it to present its findings to the Senate in the great tradition of a free Parliament in a free land. The Senate has achieved a certain amount of its objective. I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that the report of this subcommittee has influenced the governing powers who have recently, through the Prime Minister, enunciated a new set of immigration regulations. On this the Senate is to be congratulated and it is to be hoped that the subcommittee will continue to function.

We come before you, frankly, in two capacities. We identify ourselves as Canadian citizens who range themselves alongside other citizens to assert that Canada's interests economically, socially and morally will the better be vouchsafed if we liberalize present laws and fashion them anew so as to bring to Canada many good people who wish to carve out new lives in a new country. We are at one with those who find that our laws are unduly restrictive. Canada's future social and economic well-being depend upon her ability to accept concepts different from those which have characterized the immigration acts and regulations since the late twenties.

We come before you, too, as special pleaders. The Canadian Jewish Congress represents the Jewish community of Canada. It says to you that the new world is not redressing the balance of the old when two years after V-E Day, very few refugees have entered this country.

Insofar as we have figures at all, they indicate that very few Jews, for example, have entered Canada since the end of the war. As a matter of fact the percentage of Jews among those who entered Canada during the past year is smaller than it had been in the past. Yet surely every member of this committee realizes that there is not a class of prospective immigrants in Europe which more sincerely and urgently seeks entry into this country.

I would like to say a few words about the Jewish displaced persons, as the term is commonly used. They are excellent, hardy stock who have survived the brutalities of Nazism and have fled from the political conditions and the horrible memories which they would find in the land of their birth. There does not attach a shadow of an accusation of war crimes or of collaboration against any of them; nor can one conceive their political views to be antipathetic to Canadianism. On the other hand, it is their opposition to Communist influence which makes them voluntary exiles. Never has there been a group of citizens so tested in their devotion to democratic freedom as we understand the words.

There is another quality among them which I would bring to your attention. Their standard of education, of initiative and of vocational training is very high. Indeed, during the past twelve months there has been instituted among them an excellent system of training for various skills and trades which were selected for their ultimate usefulness in such possible countries of adoption as Canada.

I would also like to bring before you the repeatedly expressed views of Canadian public opinion in regard to these displaced persons. Without placing too literal a value upon routine reiterations of moral truths, it can be said in all honesty that every section of the Canadian press and every instrument of expression of public opinion indicates that Canadians of both languages, of all creeds and classes from coast to coast are unanimous in the belief that it is a practical matter of obligation for this dominion to act generously and vigorously

towards the relief of their plight. Canadians have differences of opinion on other aspects of the immigration problem, but we have never yet seen a denial of Canada's responsibility towards the displaced persons and any number of newspapers of varying political views have urged strong and early action. Indeed, the most consistent criticism of the government has taken the form of charges that the government has not promulgated or acted upon a sufficiently vigorous immigration policy. Each time the government has moved in the direction of liberalizing its policies it has met with unanimous commendation.

In the House of Commons on Thursday, May 1, the Prime Minister took cognizance of this manifestation of public opinion and announced that the Government is contemplating legislation for the admission of displaced persons and tabling an Order in Council providing for the admission of married relatives of the categories of relatives provided for in the present orders in council. These changes are important and the Canadian public has already found much satisfaction in them. The action taken is commendatory.

The immigrants whom Canada has admitted during recent years have proven excellent material in every regard. Every member of this committee probably knows in his own experience refugees who have repaid the dominion richly for its hospitality. They have served Canada well in times of war and peace. Scores have distinguished themselves by their contributions in every sphere. Each of the others has humbly but usefully worked for a living, established a Canadian family, learned English or French and is contributing in his own way to the economy and the culture of our country.

Nevertheless, in spite of this record, the number of admissions of Jewish immigrants is conspicuously small. I do not say this with any implication that there has been a deliberateness about this, but it is definitely true that each of the major categories of recent admissions and each of the proposed liberalizations of the law which are being talked about so much in the press does not envisage any tangible proportion of Jews among the settlers. The largest movement of non-British immigrants carried out in nearly a decade has been that of the Polish soldiers. I do not wish to speak in criticism of this project but I do wish to record that in spite of the considerable number of Jews who have fought with General Anders' army, have shared the hazards of war with them, only three out of the first 2,900 to come to Canada were Jews. We know that others, Jews in the Polish army, who were also qualified under the terms of admission, were not given the opportunity of presenting themselves before the Canadian officers who were making the selection.

Again, when there is talk of bringing women for work in Canadian textile plants, a religious qualification is made which excludes Jews. This is not necessarily an isolated case. While the manpower shortage in the dominion in various fields is well-known, steps have been taken to facilitate the entry of agricultural hands, lumber workers and fishermen, occupations in which as is known the percentage of Jews is relatively small. Again, I would not be misunderstood as criticizing these positive measures. I am only drawing your attention to the fact that they are not contributing to the grave problem of the Jewish displaced persons.

The regulations dealing with the admission of relatives of Canadian residents have been liberalized in accordance with the new Order in Council. This is a source of satisfaction to numbers of people who were formerly blocked in their efforts to offer assistance to their kith and kin overseas. The Government deserves and will receive commendation for this. However, it may not be unfair nor inopportune to state that close kin of Canadians are still barred under these regulations. We would contend that until legislation provides for immediate relatives up to and including first cousins and their children, the regulations will be bereft of true meaning for many Canadians who wish to aid their close kin.

I would also recall another element of the thinking of this committee, which deserves full consideration. In your report to the Senate you recommended greater emphasis on the economic readiness of the Canadian families or sponsors to help establish the immigrant as a useful citizen of this country. This goes beyond mere guarantees that the immigrant will not become a public charge and is in line with the realities of the Canadian economic picture. It is also concurrent with advanced thinking on the problem of settlement and migration. We would therefore suggest amendments to the regulations permitting Canadians to bring in immigrants whom they can settle even if they are of more distant degrees of consanguinity.

I would, however, emphasize this thought. The problem of the Jewish displaced persons in Europe is a specific one, offering this dominion an excellent opportunity of securing fine, prospective citizens for whose admission future generations of Canadians will be grateful to the government. It is also a specific responsibility of which the Canadian public is clearly aware. It will not be met automatically or without special thought being given to it in the formulation of Canada's immigration policy. We know from Canadian history that the most effective and worthwhile projects for the admission of Jews to this country came when the government granted permission to certain specific numbers of Jewish settlers. This was usually done by arrangement with Jewish community leaders who guaranteed the government against any of the settlers becoming a burden upon the public and who assisted in their settlement and in their assimilation to Canadian conditions and loyalties. Each of these projects has turned out successfully and it is through no accident that these same community organizations have also been the leaders in all patriotic and civic projects in time of peace and in the war effort in more sombre days. It was thus that war orphans were brought into Canada after the last war, that several thousand were brought from Rumania in the early 1920's, that hundreds of refugees were settled on the land just before the war broke out, that a thousand refugees who were in England were placed in Canada and their efforts harnessed for the nation's war effort.

I should like to revert to the question of displaced persons and the possibility of opening doors to the admission of a number of them. The Prime Minister in his speech to the House of Commons on May 1, stated that in principle the Government was going to send its officers to make a survey so that in time some thousands of these people could find entry in Canada.

We urge that among other steps the government agree to the admission of a reasonable number of Jews from Europe upon carefully agreed conservative terms. Our organization is prepared to carry out such conditions carefully with a full sense of responsibility not only towards these settlers but towards our country as a whole. Arrangements could be made for the training overseas of these settlers in skills needed in this country and for a carefully prepared course of indoctrination of Canadianism. Nor need this committee take undue responsibility in the question of transport. We have not any doubt that special arrangements could be made to bring these people over without affecting the flow of settlers from Britain. Even if for any reason these men and women could not be brought to this dominion at once and if they should need to await in Europe for a time, the very knowledge that the Canadian Government is acting in its own traditions for the admission of those seeking new homes in freedom and in human dignity, will send a ray of light in a world which is darkening from fear that the professors of fine ideals are slow to live up to them in so far as the stranger outside the gate is concerned.

Several days ago the New York *Times* published an appeal which the moderate and representative committee of Jews in Germany made to the Secretary General of the United Nations. I am now quoting: "How is it possible that this world which during the war expressed so many times its deepest



sympathy for our tragedy could forget so quickly about it and after six years of concentration camps let us vegetate two years more in displaced person camps?"

We must remember that when they speak of "this world" which is forgetting them they are thinking specifically of Canada whose government during the years of war has repeatedly and publicly given assurances that Canada would do its share for these allies of ours.

Time appears to be a vital element in these matters. There are several hundred thousand refugees in Austria, Germany and Italy. They are Catholics, Protestants and Jews, perhaps 60 per cent are Catholic, 20 per cent are Jewish and 20 per cent Protestant. The national origin of these people are in the main Baltic, Polish, Czech. There are skilled people, technicians, apprentices and unskilled workers. By a fortuitous circumstance Canada's economic interests coincide with the claims on her moral obligations. Canada can assume moral leadership by offering a home quickly to a number of these displaced persons. In the process it will bring upon itself a lasting benefit.

In thanking you for your manifestation of interest, I would like to recapitulate certain points of our recommendations:

(1) That the Senate recommend the appointment of a commission of several members of Parliament to visit the camps and billets of the displaced persons in Germany, Austria and Italy. The report resulting from such a commission would bring home to Parliament and the Canadian people the real benefit which will accrue to Canada from immediate action in allowing the entry of displaced persons;

(2) That the present Immigration Act and amendments be further amended to include all immediate relatives (up to and including first cousins and their children) of any persons legally admitted to and resident in Canada who are in a position to receive and care for such relatives;

(3) That there is a real need in Canada for skilled workers in the building trades, in the clothing industry and household workers. Selected groups of these people ought to be offered entry to Canada.

(4) That arrangements should be made with responsible organizations for the movement into this country of displaced persons under the corporate guarantee of these organizations.

(5) That the admission to Canada of persons be regulated to favour those of various racial and religious backgrounds with no special preference for any one group and with no special disabilities for any other group.

We put our trust in the innate good judgment and moral qualities of the legislators of this Dominion that they will proceed with dispatch and goodwill to find ways and means of aiding those in Canada who yet are barred from bringing in their close kith and kin and those who would employ people of certain skills not yet provided for in the legislation. Modification of our present laws as announced by the Prime Minister in conformity with the pleas of the Canadian Jewish Congress and other organizations would aid the economy of our country and would expedite the rehabilitation of many worthwhile people who, after a decade of persecution, look forward to a new life which will benefit themselves and the country of their adoption.

In behalf of my colleagues and for the Canadian Jewish Congress I make these submissions with sincere thanks to the Senate Committee for conducting this inquiry.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I have one or two questions I would like to ask arising out of this brief. To begin with I would like to acknowledge the kind remarks made by the speaker with regard to this committee and its activities and also to compliment him on the splendid statement he has made. However, arising out of it I have the impression that in its early stages there is a suggestion there is some discrimination shown by Canada, or her immigration officials, in bringing



the Jews to Canada. Now I would be sorry to think that that was so and I am able to say that my own experience with the Immigration Department would lead me to suppose that it is not so. It may be that I am not looking that way. I am not looking for discrimination and perhaps for that reason I do not see it. In my own experience I have not observed it. I have found that the officers in the Immigration Department are prepared in every human way to follow out what you say in your last paragraph here, "with no special preference for any one group". Now, do I correctly understand any implication in your statement that there was discrimination of the kind I have mentioned?

Mr. GARBER: I would be sorry if there is any such implication arising from the statement. What we do mean is this, that there is certainly no deliberate discrimination against Jews but a certain discrimination results from the fact of favouring certain trades. For instance, bringing in more agricultural workers and lumber workers and people engaged in similar trades. In so far as the Jews are concerned, that is discrimination because for one reason or another Jews have not been engaged in those professions and so therefore they will not qualify.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But isn't that a purely gratuitous circumstance?

Mr. GARBER: Yes, but it is unfortunate that for this reason we cannot benefit from the broadening of the legislation up to this point. If the amendment would include, among several things, tailors, furriers, carpenters, and so on, Jews would qualify.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: All those in the needle trades.

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: And shoemakers.

Mr. GARBER: Yes. The Jewish people have not done a great deal for Canada in the agricultural industry perhaps, but in these industries, which I have mentioned, they are very definitely in need of help and so far the Jews have done a very great deal to help them.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There have been times that labour organizations in this country have raised great opposition to any immigration coming in that would engage in these trades.

Mr. GARBER: I believe that latterly they have supported any intimation that we have made for their admission. Perhaps Mr. Hayes might give us some information on this.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: They did not object last year to the farmers coming in.

Mr. GARBER: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I want to ask some more questions.

Mr. GARBER: I mean there is a change in the position of the Union.

Mr. HAYES: In the last two years the Labour Unions—that is the two national organizations which represent the important unions in Canada—that is the Canadian Congress of Labour and the Trades and Labour Congress have both gone on record at their annual conferences, as well as in submissions of principle they make annually to the Prime Minister when they see him in delegation, that they are favourable to supporting any plan whereby Canada would take in any number of displaced persons as a solution to the problem. In dealing with the matter the only trade industries and representatives of the Unions, who to my knowledge both represent the men's clothing and women's clothing industry and the millinery industry, have proceeded with the manufacturers to Ottawa and interviewed the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Resources and in unison have made a plea that the laws ought to be amended to permit the entry of skilled workers in these industries.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What I was going to say following out my question was that we have had two groups of displaced persons arrive in Canada so far.

One consisted of 52 persons and the other of 50 persons. That is, there have been 102 persons arrive so far so that what attitude the Department takes in the selecting of them does not show as yet, the results are so small.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Of course we know that it is true that if any discrimination with regard to the Poles occurred in the Army itself, our officials were not responsible. I happen to know the figures. I think it was limited to one particular type of Pole. I had occasion to get that information.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It was the Polish Army we were dealing with.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes, there has been discrimination both against Jews and Protestants there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You say that the recent widening of the categories—I am looking at page 3 of your statement “does not envisage any tangible portion of Jews among the settlers”. You are not asking surely, are you, that when we widen the regulations we make any special reference to any religious group.

Mr. GARBER: Certainly not.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I wanted to clear that up as we go.

Mr. GARBER: We have on record applications from Canadian Jewish citizens for the admission of relatives. Now if you limit relatives to the categories that we have up to date we know as a matter of fact there will be very few Jews come in. If the categories were broadened out to include cousins of the first degree, there would be some chance. I am referring to the consequences, not the motive of the legislation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. GARBER: The legislation must be without regard to creeds or races.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I suppose you would agree with me that the first priority should be given to the nearest relatives.

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In that regard the present categories are satisfactory. You would give priority to a son or daughter or brother or sister over a cousin?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: So that those categories are all right the way they stand.

Mr. GARBER: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is no criticism of them at all.

Mr. GARBER: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But what you hope is that after these people have arrived, we will then extend the categories to cousins and their families.

Mr. GARBER: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am all with you in that.

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Suppose a group of 10,000 Jewish people—as far as I am concerned I have nothing to say against the Jewish people at all, but I would like to get this opinion—suppose it was taken for granted that we admit 10,000 people, what percentage of that 10,000 would engage in agriculture, lumbering or mining?

Mr. GARBER: Probably very few.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Very few?

Mr. GARBER: From those that we know are in Europe now, I do not think few, if any, have been trained for those particular occupations.

Hon. Mr. MACKINNON: With reference to the people brought in, the Poles, were they not brought in for agriculture?

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacKINNON: Would that mean that the Jews in the Army would not have been suited for agricultural work?

Mr. GARBER: If they were told they would have to stay on a farm for a year or two, they would have abided by the contract, but I would say quite honestly perhaps that they were never trained for farm work. The greater part of the Jews that they had in the Polish Army came from the city. In Poland Jews were restricted in their rights to settle on the land even if they wanted to.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I notice this paragraph No. 4 in your recent stipulations "that arrangements should be made with responsible organizations for the movement into this country of displaced persons under the corporate guarantee of these organizations". Would you mind explaining that and elaborating on that a little as far as your organization is concerned. What do you ask and what are you prepared to do as an organization?

Mr. GARBER: Would you permit me to ask Mr. Hayes to answer this.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. HAYES: I was behind this particular recommendation. I was referring back to what took place in the United States about one and a half years ago. In addition to the quota system that was in existence there, they also have the so-called Truman directive which was given by the President to try and assist displaced persons over and above those who might qualify by affidavits given by their relatives. The directive indicated that organizations who were certified by the Government and who were willing to give corporate affidavits, would assume a legal responsibility which the law only provides for relatives to do. Some 9,000 people were accepted under that guarantee. This was not amplified and perhaps it should have been. The responsible organizations are those certified by the particular department concerned. What we mean is that if a certain number could be allotted to an organization, agreed upon in advance, it will be possible for a number of people who do not have relatives in this country to be allowed passage into the country, brought in under the corporate guarantee of an organization, willing and able to do so and certified as such.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is a situation which needs elaboration. That your organization is prepared to do something. Mr. Garber said that if you were allowed to bring them in the securing of shipping would not be so important, that you would meet that problem.

Mr. HAYES: I think the implication of meeting the problem was not to create shipping where no ships exist but in this sense the people knowing they have a place to go to some determinate time, would prepare themselves for it. The unfortunate situation now is that there are many people who are in the position of not knowing where they will have a haven or when it will be. Say that all the shipping conditions cannot be remedied for five years or more even, they would train themselves day by day with the knowledge that they had some definite place to go to at some future time. They would know that they were coming to Canada or whatever country will take them.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There may be some very fine people who have no relatives that you would qualify.

Mr. HAYES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: And there may be other people too.

Mr. HAYES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you representatives in Europe now?

Mr. HAYES: Yes we have representatives in the displaced persons camps in Germany and Austria, that is the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. That organization has about 300 workers and we have some Canadians attached



to that organization who are very familiar with the situation in Germany, Austria and Italy.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And if you were permitted to bring in a certain number, would you send officers to Europe to handle the matter?

Mr. HAYES: There are the ones there who are now working with the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees and the Canadian Government.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is your organization prepared to pay the expenses to bring these people here rather than ask that they be brought in at Government expense.

Mr. HAYES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You would pay the shipping.

Mr. HAYES: On that point we have not yet gone into the details. We were of the opinion that the Inter-Governmental Committee have a certain fund for displaced persons covering shipping. If that international convention did take care of it, then we would not have to take care of it, but I assume that where they could not be taken care of by the international committee, it would follow that the organization concerned would have to admit responsibility.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Formerly the Immigration Department were ready to admit perhaps one or two persons, members of a family. I think this would apply particularly with regard to Jewish immigrants. For instance, asking for cousins to be admitted it may be that they would be the only one in Canada, due to the persecution which has been carried out by the Nazis.

Mr. HAYES: There is a precedence to this. During the war years the Canadian Government were as anxious—at our request—to have certain refugees get out of Portugal, Tangiers and Spain. These people had escaped the Gestapo and gone into Spain or Portugal. The Canadian Government agreed to the admission of a certain number of these people provided we guarantee their care and maintenance, which we did. They also allowed a number of people in who were stranded at Shanghai. In this case again our corporate guarantee was accepted by the Government so it is not a new concept.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Then you had something to do with the proposal to bring 1,000 children from France.

Mr. HAYES: That is the third example of what I was outlining. Recently the Government announced an order in council which permits the entry of 1,000 children under our corporate guarantee.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Can you tell us what you are doing in that regard.

Mr. HAYES: Yes. In that project we were about to work very closely with the Canadian Welfare Council. We haven't entered negotiations as yet but I presume the arrangements were entered into in 1942 when the matter first came up and when we received permission to bring in 500 children from France. At that time we had made arrangements with the department and with the Canadian Welfare Council so that all the standard arrangements would be followed. We had made arrangements with all the western provinces from Manitoba to British Columbia for the Provincial Government and their department of child welfare to accept a certain number of children and assist in securing foster homes for them. We propose to follow the same procedure in this matter.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Mr. Cresswell can talk about Jewish farmers that have settled in Ontario.

Mr. CRESSWELL: Before the war—two years immediately preceding the war—we brought in quite a number of Jewish farmers, principally from Lithuania. They were settled mostly in the Niagara district and they have made very outstanding successes.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I notice that at the conclusion of Mr. Cresswell's splendid memorandum there was an appendix attached. "The following is a summary of the displaced persons, who towards the end of the last year were receiving UNRRA assistance in the British, United States and French zones of Germany and in Austria and Italy (this does not include the hundreds of thousands of other displaced persons who are not registered)". Now Mr. Garber may not agree with this statement as to the figures but he says here that the Polish represent 32·02 per cent agricultural. Czechoslovakia 25 per cent and the Jewish 5·15 per cent. Only the Greek which had 3·78 per cent and the Austrian which had 2·39 per cent, were lower, so that you will see that the Jewish percentage of agriculturists is very low, according to Mr. Cresswell's figures. Perhaps you do not agree with that, Mr. Garber.

Mr. GARBER: I am surprised it is that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You thought it was less.

Mr. GARBER: Yes. That comes from the fact that Jews cannot own land in many countries.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: In what countries?

Mr. GARBER: I do not want to go far back but I know in Poland it was very difficult for Jews to remain on the land.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The average is 23·26 per cent.

Mr. GARBER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now where are we at?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We want to hear Mr. Hayes yet.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. SAUL HAYES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief because the pith and substance of our representations are in this particular set of representations but I would like to categorically state that in all our dealings which we have had with officials of the Immigration Department our experience is parallel to that which Senator Roebuck outlined. We have had no cause for any complaints. I have worked with them for some years and there have been no instances of discrimination or preferential treatment. I can only state that the officials of the Immigration Department have been at all times not only very courteous but have always followed the provisions of the law as scrupulously and as fairly as they could be followed. We do not want to create a contrary impression. If we have done so it is the fault of the brief, not because the facts are so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I wanted to bring that out.

Mr. HAYES: Now I would like again to revert to this matter of what we feel are the preferences. The question was asked about the Polish farmers and the statement was made that only three Jews came among the 2,800 or so of the 4,000 who came to Canada. The fault was not with the Canadian immigration officials, it was with the Polish officers, who refused to give any leave to these Jews who wanted to apply to the Canadian immigration officers. There were more than three who could qualify despite the low average of farmers among the Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army. There are at least 50 cases to our knowledge of Jewish soldiers in the Polish Army who could qualify, but who were not permitted to come. That has nothing to do with the Canadian Immigration officials either on the spot or at Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Nor the labour officers who were there.

Mr. HAYES: Not to our knowledge.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Do you mean that it was left to Polish officers to decide this matter?

Mr. HAYES: According to the information we have the procedure was that all the encampments of the Polish Army were visited and the people there had to apply to their officers and obtain passes from their officers in order to be permitted to leave the billets where they were.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I can hardly credit what sense there was in sending anyone over from Canada if that was the way it was done. They might as well have left it to the Polish officers.

Mr. HAYES: There was a screening before that. Before they reached the Canadian officer, they were all screened. It was not feasible perhaps for Canadian officers to visit 200,000 or more Polish soldiers. They were all screened and their names sent forward. That was perhaps the only practical procedure.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I happened to be on the train with a group of men who were going to farms in Saskatchewan. I asked a Polish fellow in the group who could speak English, "You worked on a farm?" No, he never worked on a farm in his life, never did a day's work on a farm; he worked in a bank. "Well," I said, "I thought you fellows were all supposed to have had farming experience." He had not any. I do not know how many of the others had.

Mr. HAYES: The first recommendation is: "That the Senate recommend the appointment of a commission of several members of parliament to visit the camps and billets of the displaced persons in Germany, Austria and Italy."

The reason for the inclusion of such a recommendation is that in Canada, although there have been a number of persons who have toured the camps, either professionally, as UNRRA workers, or as chaplains attached to the Canadian army, and who are quite familiar with the situation in the camps, unfortunately no official mission has ever gone forward other than recently a number of immigration officers who were there for a specific purpose. It seems perhaps a suggestion worthy of consideration that the Canadian representatives and the Canadian people themselves ought to get a first-hand indication of the camps of whom the people are in the camps, their worth, their capabilities, their background, and their desire to come to Canada, because so far we have had this various experience of people working in the camps who say that Canada is missing a great opportunity by not having invited a number of these displaced persons to come here. But apart from this method of having a report on the conditions of the people, as well as their capabilities, there have been no commissions to these camps, such as have proceeded from a number of other countries, such as Brazil.

The second point, about the inclusion of immediate relatives, has been referred to by Mr. Garber and is also dealt with in the reply on the question of the corporate guarantee.

I would like to make a statement with reference to the establishment of refugee industries in this country, and in that connection to table the issue of *Foreign Trade* under date of February 22, 1947. This is a publication which is published by authority of the Hon. James A. MacKinnon, Minister of Trade and Commerce. On pages 331, 332 and 333 of this particular issue is an article which indicates that sixty-five firms of foreign origin, with an estimated gross output of \$50,000,000, are now established in Canada. It indicates also that in 1944 there were fifty-six plants with six thousand employees, and having a gross output of \$43,000,000. This article mentions some of the outstanding examples of "refugee" industrial plants, such as Bata Shoe Company, Louis Fischel Glove Company, Koerner Brothers, John Petrik Limited, Andreef Sporting Goods, Huntingdon Woollen Mills and five or six others.

It may be interesting to have this article to indicate the great accomplishments of a number of refugees who have entered this country, as an indication solely of the skills which these people have and can bring to Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is a government document issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce: is that right?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Could the Secretary obtain a sufficient number of copies to send to each one of the committee?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: We all get them.

The CHAIRMAN: We get a copy every month.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I think the suggestion which has been made is a good one, from this point of view: our printed proceedings go into the hands of a number of people all over Canada. The information which is in this article is of value, and you have stated that it would only occupy two or three pages?

Mr. HAYES: That is all, sir.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not think it would add very much to the volume of our record.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections we will have a condensation made of these two or three pages, or print them in full and put in our report.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: The two or three pages would not take up a great deal of our report.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think it would be well worth while.

Mr. HAYES: I would also like to refer, if I may, to a book which has recently been published, called *Refugees in America*. It is a report of the committee for the study of recent immigration from Europe. This book was published under rather interesting auspices, having been sponsored by the American Christian Committee for Refugees, the American Friends Service Committee, the Catholic Committee for Refugees, the National Refugee Service, and the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, as well as the National Service to Foreign Born of the National Council of Jewish Women. This book is extremely interesting; and although it refers to conditions in the United States, it nevertheless, for those who wish to read some of the chapters, will indicate answers to a number of the problems which people have often posed—such matters as: the refugees as citizens, organized life of the refugees, their social and cultural adjustment, factors in their social adjustment, solution of the refugee problem and its international aspects. The reason I picked this book out is because of the sponsorship and because of the work of those who formed the committee to study this matter. We see such names as Alvin Johnson, Joseph P. Chamberlain, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Rufus M. Jones, Clarence E. Pickett, William Rosenwald, George N. Shuster, as well as a list of three pages of sponsors. If it would not be considered presumptuous, I would recommend this book as being a source of material for certain matters, if it is not already within the cognizance of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN: You think we ought to have that as some of our twilight reading?

Mr. HAYES: It might assist in one's slumbers, perhaps.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: When you are speaking of refugee children, they are all orphans, are they?

Mr. HAYES: Quite.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: If you are moving them over here, do you intend that they shall be adopted in Jewish families in Canada?

Mr. HAYES: That is the purpose.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You would have no difficulty in that respect?

Mr. HAYES: We think not, because the number of calls made on us over a period of years for children to be placed in foster homes, and for adoption, has



been very great. We have had considerable experience, having made preliminary investigations in 1942, when the matter was first mooted.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You had no difficulty then.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: What would the expense per child be?

Mr. HAYES: I would not be able to answer that.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Approximately?

Mr. HAYES: To bring a child here?

Mr. MOLLOY: Yes.

Mr. HAYES: Well, the expense would be as follows. Most of these children would not, I believe, come within the purview of the jurisdiction of the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees, so that the transportation costs might involve—I do not know what it would be, perhaps our friends from the C.P.R. are more familiar with this—perhaps \$150.

Mr. CRESSWELL: It depends on the age.

Mr. HAYES: Up to 18.

Mr. CRESSWELL: About \$150.

Mr. HAYES: Then there would be the cost of an investigation across Canada for homes, and the fees of social workers to conduct the investigation of foster homes to be sure that they meet the requirements of the various provincial statutes covering the care and reception of children, and the preliminary cost of maintenance until the children have found the homes, and until they are placed in those homes. I think the biggest individual cost per capita would be transportation cost to bring them over.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Would there be a screening operation in Europe before they are brought over?

Mr. HAYES: Presumably the same regulations would apply as apply for any person who wishes to come to Canada. That is, they would be brought to the Paris office of the Canadian immigration branch, or to the one at The Hague, or any other of the European offices, and the immigration officers would certify them as to health and do the other screening which the present laws envisage. In other words, according to my knowledge of the procedure, the only difference between this particular group of prospective immigrants and any other is, that a special order in council is passed to admit them. Other than that, I believe the procedures would be exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That order in council has not yet been passed, has it?

Mr. HAYES: Yes, it has.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Do you remember the name of the colonel who had a plan for bringing five hundred children to Alberta?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I never heard of the colonel.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: He had a good, laboriously worked-out scheme.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you got that order in council? If so you might put it on record.

Mr. HAYES: The order in council is No. 1647, approved on the 29th of April, 1947, on the recommendation of the Minister of Mines and Resources.



## P.C. 1647

CERTIFIED to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 29th April, 1947.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 21st April, 1947, from the Minister of Mines and Resources, stating that on October 2, 1942, authority was given for the entry to Canada of 500 Jewish orphan children from France with the understanding that an additional 500 might later be authorized upon it being ascertained that the second group could be properly placed and cared for;

That the subsequent control of France by enemy agencies prevented the movement of the children; and

That the Canadian Jewish Congress have requested on humanitarian grounds a renewal of the authority issued in 1942.

The Minister, recognizing the fact that approval of such request will contribute in some measure to a solution of the problem of displaced persons and taking into consideration the humanitarian aspects of the matter, recommends that the provisions of Order in Council P.C. 695, dated the 21st day of March, 1931, as subsequently amended, be waived in regard to 1,000 Jewish orphan children under the age of eighteen years, who can otherwise comply with the provisions of the Immigration Act and Regulations, the term "orphan" to mean a child bereaved of both parents, such admission to be subject to guarantees regarding reception, placement and public charge liability satisfactory to the Minister of Mines and Resources.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

A. M. HILL,  
*Asst. Clerk of the Privy Council.*

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is that all, Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES: As far as I am concerned. Thank you very much for hearing me.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You have certainly given us a lot of information, and we are very glad you came.

Mr. HAYES: We are very glad of the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged for the information we have received.

We will now adjourn until tomorrow at 10.30.

## APPENDIX "A"

Extract from *Foreign Trade*

OTTAWA, February 22, 1947.

"REFUGEE" INDUSTRIES PRODUCING WIDE VARIETY  
OF COMMODITIES

*Sixty-five firms of foreign origin, with estimated gross output of some \$50,000,000, now established in Canada—Provide useful employment and goods for domestic or overseas consumption—New skills being introduced to the advantage of this country*

Canada is encouraging the establishment of "refugee" industries, thereby furnishing additional employment, producing consumer goods already in short domestic supply and providing merchandise for export to other countries in exchange for commodities required to maintain the present standard of living in this Dominion. It is estimated that *sixty-five firms in this category are now operating in Canada*, and that their aggregate gross output approximates \$50,000,000. Besides the production of new items for home consumption and shipment abroad, these industries have in some cases introduced new skills that contribute towards the development of this country.

*Expenditure on Wages, Materials and Power*

A survey of this situation, undertaken by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, reveals that in 1944 there were fifty-six "refugee" industries operating in Canada. They employed 6,000 workers and had an aggregate gross output of approximately \$43,000,000. It was estimated that raw materials to the value of \$22,000,000 were utilized, and that nearly \$10,000,000 was paid out in salaries and wages. Expenditures on fuel and electricity amounted to about \$448,000. The wide diversification of these industries is set forth in the following table, which indicates the largest number are engaged in the production of textiles and textile products, though the plants producing wood and paper products had a higher aggregate gross output.

## "REFUGEE" INDUSTRIES IN CANADA IN 1944

Industrial groups	No. plants	No. employees	Gross output
Animal products .....	5	858	\$11,340,165
Textile and textile products.....	21	1,259	6,786,505
Wood and paper products.....	10	1,887	12,720,355
Iron and its products.....	5	1,314	8,595,831
Non-metallic mineral products.....	3	50	193,939
Chemicals and allied products.....	4	76	348,990
Miscellaneous industries .....	5	187	978,463
Vegetable products .....	2)		
Non-ferrous metal products.....	1)		
		265	1,956,672
Total .....	56	5,896	\$42,920,920

Of those engaged in the manufacture of textiles and textile products, three were producing flax fibre; four, hosiery and knitted goods; five, woollen goods that included cloth and yarn; five, other primary textiles that included cotton thread, cotton yarn and cloth, dyeing and finishing, narrow fabrics, silk and silk goods; and four, secondary textiles that included men's clothing, women's clothing and corsets.

*Industries Established in Five Provinces*

These industries were established in five of Canada's nine provinces, with 26 in Ontario, 25 in Quebec, three in British Columbia, and one each in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. It is evident that these firms were carefully planned and developed, as only one, and that a relatively unimportant wooden toy factory, has gone into liquidation. Operation of eleven outstanding examples in this group of industries are set forth below, indicating in brief the origin of their principals, the character of the business in which they are engaged and the manner in which they are contributing to the foreign trade of Canada.

*Eleven Outstanding Examples Listed*

Bata Shoe Company of Canada, Limited, located at Batawa, Ontario, is of Czechoslovakian origin. It operates three plants, employing over 400 workers. After making a large contribution to the war effort through the production of a wide range of intricate machines for the manufacture of war materials, these plants are almost completely reconverted to peace-time operations. The principal products are women's shoes, but shoemaking machinery and even fishing reels are manufactured.

Louis Fischl Glove Company, Limited, located at Prescott, Ontario, is of Czechoslovakian origin. It operates two plants, employing nearly two hundred workers, and produces a wide variety of high-grade gloves.

Koerner Brothers, Limited, located at New Westminster, B.C., is of Czechoslovakian origin. This firm has commercialized for the first time on a large scale the utilization of western hemlock, which is newly named Alaska pine. Its three plants produce a wide variety of finished lumber items, including flooring, boxes and box shooks.

Prencos Progress and Engineering Corporation, located in Toronto, Ontario, is of Czechoslovakian origin. This firm commenced operations during the early part of the last war in an old stable, and expanded rapidly until it was producing equipment for the armed forces, including flame throwers. It is completely reconverted, and is producing a variety of items that include nozzles for oil burners, and hydraulic and braking equipment for aircraft.

John Petrik, Limited, located at Woodstock, Ontario, is of Hungarian origin. This firm employs over a hundred workers, engaged in the production of decorative porcelain. As business expands, two additional plants will be established in Canada and possibly one in the United States.

Industrial Steel and Fibre, Limited, located in Montreal, is of Roumanian origin. This firm assisted during the war in developing new containers for shells that effected material economies, and is now reconverted for the production of a wide range of containers.

A. Andreef Sporting Goods, Limited, located in Montreal, Que., is of Belgian and Russian origin. This firm was established in 1939 for the manufacture of tennis racquets and skis of European design. During the war, laminated skis were produced for the armed forces and "knees" for ships. It has been reconverted to peacetime operations, and a new plant at Ste Thérèse will provide employment for 125 workers.

L'Hoir Aluminum & Stainless Steel Products, Inc., located at Levis, Que., is of Belgian origin. This firm was established during the early part of the war by a technician skilled in working metals, and particularly those of the non-ferrous group. Various component parts for munitions were manufactured, but the plant has been reconverted for the production of aluminum, stainless steel and other metal utensils and equipment. It employs about sixty-five workers.

Tricotex Company, Limited, located at Sherbrooke, Que., is of Czechoslovakian origin. A number of new textile products, including glove linings, have been developed by this firm.

Huntingdon Woollen Mills, Limited, located at Huntingdon, Que., is of Polish origin. It has erected a large modern woollen mill for the production of overcoat materials.

Staroba Industrial Research Company, Limited, located in Toronto, Ontario, is of Czechoslovakian origin. This firm, which was originally connected with the Bata organization, is now producing precision instruments of high quality.

#### *Export-Import Houses Organized*

In addition to the establishment of "refugee" industries, engaged in the actual manufacture of various products, a number of trained nationals of other lands have organized import and export houses. They are enabled to take full advantage of long experience gained in foreign trade, and their respective enterprises are making a useful contribution to the external trade of this country.





Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
F

Canada Immigration and Labour  
— Standing Committee, 1947

(1947)

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

## Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 7

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947.

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

Mr. Karel Buzek, Toronto, Ontario, National Secretary, Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada.

Mr. Rudolf Koren, Toronto, Ontario, President, Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada.

Mr. Sven Stadius, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Toronto Finnish Advancement Association.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, 8th May, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Buchanan, Daigle, Horner, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor and Wilson—12.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Honourable Senator Daigle was heard and presented and read a Resolution by the Association of Professional Hotelmen of the Province of Quebec, recommending immigration to Canada of experienced chefs and cooks from European Allied Countries.

Mr. Karel Buzek, Toronto, Ontario, National Secretary, Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada, presented and read a brief on behalf of the said Alliance recommending admittance to Canada of all relatives of Canadians of Czechoslovak origin.

Mr. Rudolph Koren, Toronto, Ontario, President, Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada, was heard with respect to immigration to Canada of Czechoslovak people.

Mr. Sven Stadius, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Toronto Finnish Advancement Association, presented and read a brief by Mr. Kingsley Graham, Honorary Consul for the Republic of Finland, on behalf of the Finnish Advancement Association, with respect to immigration to Canada of displaced persons of Europe, and giving an outline of the history of the Finnish people.

At 11.50 o'clock, a.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday, 14th May, instant, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

THURSDAY, May 8, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we can start. This morning our colleague Senator Daigle said he had something he would like to present to us, and I think that if there are no objections we will hear him first.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: I will read:—

At the regular meeting, held at general headquarters, 4 Notre-Dame Street East, Montreal, on May 5, 1947, the Association of Professional Hotelmen of the Province, with an active membership of five hundred and forty-five adopted the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the Province of Quebec possesses all necessary attraction with which to attract tourists;

Resolved that the Tourist industry is the most lucrative in the province;

Resolved that to maintain the flow of tourists into the province, the first requisite is to furnish (supply) good meals; a good table;

Resolved that all efforts, made by the hotelmen, to supply first-class meals to the visitors, have been hindered through the lack of competent chefs;

Resolved that there is no school in operation through which hotelmen would be enabled to remedy this lack;

Resolved that the only means through which competent chefs (cooks) can be obtained is by facilitating the entry into our country, of qualified chefs from Switzerland or France;

Resolved that all large hotels in the United States have, at their service, such well-qualified chefs;

Resolved that in facilitating immigration of the above-mentioned French or Swiss chefs into the country, the Canadian government would render an invaluable service, not only to the Province of Quebec, but to Canada as a whole;

Moved by Mr. A. E. Gosselin, proprietor of Hotel King George in Sherbrooke, and seconded by Mr. J. A. Dorais, proprietor of Hotel St-Jean, in St-Jean, that the above Resolution be transmitted to the Committee on Immigration, in order to acquaint the honourable members thereof with the opinion (views) entertained by the Association of Professional Hotelmen of the Province.

Adopted unanimously;

Certified copy.

GERARD DELAGE,  
*Administrator.*



The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be combination of immigration and tourist traffic.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We all approve the idea about good meals.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: This resolution is a request to this committee to further as much as possible the immigration of chefs and cooks from European allied countries. The organization itself has a membership of 545.

As the hotel industry in Canada in the last ten years has so greatly increased to-day the demand for first class chefs that the supply has been exhausted and they are, therefore, forced to employ cooks with three and four years' army experience, and in the greater majority of cases from soda bars and sandwich shops and very often these people do not rate higher than a short order cook.

If the hotel industry in this country is to flourish and improve, they will definitely be in greater need for first class men of this profession in the near future. A few of the larger hotels to-day have cooking schools whereby they train young men under the guidance of their present chefs, however, this is mainly for their own protection and of very little use to other and smaller independent hotels.

I also want to point out that many other organizations, such as hospitals and other institutions, as well as private homes are in great need of cooks and domestic help. I presume that by careful selection we could secure this category of personnel and domestic help so much wanted in Canada. This recommendation, along with others made by this committee will, I am sure, receive favourable attention from the Government and all parts of our country will derive benefits therefrom.

The CHAIRMAN: We are much obliged to you for presenting that to us.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Has not the Provincial Government got a school with five or six hundred learning cooking, operated through the Hotelmen's Association in Montreal?

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: Yes, I think they have been started for some time.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Three or four years ago.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: But I do not think they are putting out men of the right ability for chefs.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Cooking is only cooking and we have as good cooks and chefs in Canada as anywhere else. The point I make is that the Government has a school. I appreciate there may be some shortage of chefs, but I know that we in Quebec have a school of cookery. That is the primary object of it to produce cooks and chefs.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: They may produce cooks but I do not think they would produce chefs of the right kind that would work in the big hotels in Montreal.

The CHAIRMAN: It is very interesting anyway.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Perhaps it is not the quality so much of the chefs being turned out as the number, which may not be sufficient to supply the demand irrespective of their quality.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: There are three or four hundred.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think all the hotels are suffering from an inability to find chefs, to say nothing of homes for domestic help.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have a delegation from the Finns here this morning and I would not be surprised if they could supply us with cooks and chefs. We have the honour of receiving a delegation from both the Czechoslovak and Finnish organizations in Canada. There are two gentlemen from the Czechoslovak so I suppose we had better call on them first. Their delegation is com-

posed of Mr. Rudolph Koren who is the President of the Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada. With him is Mr. Karel Buzek who is the Secretary of that organization which includes practically the whole population of Slovak origin in Canada. Not everybody but pretty nearly so.

Then with us also is Mr. Sven Spadius of the Finnish Advancement Association, together with Mr. Lockstrom who is a former civil servant, resident in Ottawa and who is very much interested in these proceedings.

First, I would like to introduce Mr. Koren.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well Mr. Koren.

Mr. KOREN: Mr. Buzek is the Secretary and he has a written statement. I wish you would permit him to make it to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is all right.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I naturally called the President first.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we can hear Mr. Buzek. He can read the statement.

Mr. BUZEK: I would like to present to you, as our good friend the Honourable Senator Roebuck has mentioned we represent the Czechoslovak Alliance in Canada, this statement which has been prepared by the Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada.

Mr. Chairman and Honourable Senators:—The Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada and its members, whom we represent, feel greatly honoured by the invitation to appear before you again.

Last year, on July 24, we presented a brief on behalf of that group of Canadians who are of Czech and Slovak origin. This year we have little fresh material to add to what was said then, and for that reason were hesitant to accept Senator Roebuck's invitation, lest we take up this Committee's valuable time by repetition. By pressing his invitation, Senator Roebuck has again shown his deep interest in the work of our organization, and has indicated that our contribution to the material being considered by this Committee might not be without value.

First, we have been asked by our members to express the thanks of our organization publicly to you. There is no doubt that the Senate Committee on Immigration of last year served a very useful purpose, and that as a result of its work the public at large is better informed and has shown more understanding about immigration matters.

In our brief last year, the suggestions which we put forward for consideration were four in number:

1. Emergency measures to assist in the speedy transportation to Canada of the immediate relatives of Canadians who can support them.
2. Widening of the categories of relatives permitted to enter Canada, when shipping space permits.
3. Abandonment of the discriminatory and arbitrary division of immigrants into preferred and non-preferred classes on racial (and nationality) grounds.

You possibly remember that that referred to the division into preferred immigration and non-preferred immigration. For instance, before the war the Germans were in the preferred group and the Czechs were in the non-preferred group.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is not so now.

Mr. BUZEK: No it is not so now. A system of disinterested trusteeship over immigration policy and action, within the framework of the Department of Mines and Resources, through comprehensive inquiry and information.

Our representations to-day remain in essence what they were a year ago, but our members wish to express their gratification that various measures they advocated have been given the stamp of approval by this Committee, and that on some points raised preliminary steps to action have been taken by the government. For example, we were very pleased to read in this Committee's final report, paragraph 4, which recommended "That everything possible be done to make shipping available subject to the above mentioned repatriation, and that thereupon priority be given to the relatives, in all degrees, and to the friends of Canadian citizens who assume responsibility for the care and establishment of the new-comer, and who are well able and willing to give guarantees."

Our members were also deeply pleased that the recently-opened Canadian legation in Prague can begin to deal with immigration cases from Czechoslovakia. However, we are still wondering if something more could not be done to make shipping available—something in the nature of emergency transportation measures for the wives and children of Canadians who want to join their husbands and fathers in Canada.

Last year we said that fathers who have been separated from their families all through the war years, and even longer, were hoping for a reunion soon, and that if their hopes for reunion in Canada were dashed, they would find a way to visit their families in Europe. It seems that events have proved our statement correct, at least as far as our members were concerned. Several hundreds of them have left for their native land within the last year. Many of them sailed from American ports on former army transport boats with dormitory-style accommodation. Irrespective of their intentions when they were leaving Canada, if they will have to choose between returning to Canada alone or staying with their families in Europe indefinitely, how many will actually return? The danger is that really, as I say, it is not the very large numbers it will affect but even if it is only several hundred, it will count.

It will not serve the national interest of Canada if these men, and their families, stay in Europe only because of lack of transportation facilities. And that is why this year, we plead again for Point 1 of last year's brief. Could not something more be done to provide more ample transportation facilities, even though primitive in comfort?

Our second plea made last year, for a widening of the categories of relatives permitted to enter Canada, has to a large degree been satisfied by recent liberalizations of the immigration regulations. To what extent these liberalizations have followed from the splendid work of this Committee, we can only conjecture. Whatever the impetus, we have been instructed by our members to convey to you and through you to the government, the happiness which these changes have brought to them.

We would, however, plead for still further liberalization, to include all relatives, married and unmarried, and even those not related to Canadians, if such Canadians commit themselves to take care of them on arrival.

Everything stated in this brief is fairly obvious, and has been expressed before. To us the really fascinating thing is the interplay of forces which are at work at present. If only all the interests could remember that the time for liberalization and change is now. If Canada loses any people because of undue delays, such people may be lost forever. We feel that upon the early and successful solution of these problems depends in great measure the future of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Would you tell us how many Canadians there are of Czechoslovak origin. What is your estimate?

Mr. BUZEK: According to the 1941 census the figure was 49,912.



Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: How many of those are naturalized?

Mr. BUZEK: I would say the greatest number of them, but there was a certain percentage of them who could not get naturalized because their families are still over there and the authorities were hesitant to accept them because of that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What was their predominant occupation?

Mr. BUZEK: They all came in the 1920's and at that time the selection was rather one-sided. It was limited to people of the labouring class and many of them stayed in that class. They came into this country at the time of the depression and they had to stay in that class.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any settlements of Slovaks?

Mr. BUZEK: Yes, in Esterhazy and in Rosetown, in Saskatchewan. Not very large settlements. Farming settlements.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Most of them are distributed in the population.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: St. Walburg in Saskatchewan?

Mr. BUZEK: Yes, that's right.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: The question I want to ask now is—you spoke of some of these men going back to their families—is it not possible now, in view of the Germans being moved out of part of Czechoslovakia, there may not be homes for them in their own country now. What are the conditions? Are there people still anxious to come? You have not got the displaced persons there?

Mr. BUZEK: No. What we are pleading for is where Canadians have been separated from their families right through the war who have been living in the hope that their families would be able to come and join them in this country. That has not been so. It is two years after the war and it is still very difficult to bring families out because of the lack of transportation facilities.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Do you think there may be a possibility that some of these people may wish to remain and not return?

Mr. BUZEK: If their departure for Canada is delayed for a great deal of time.

The CHAIRMAN: Some of them have gone back to get their families over there.

Mr. BUZEK: Yes. When they could not get their families to Canada quick enough, they found a way of visiting them over there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know what arrangements have been made with our Immigration Department to guarantee the return of these men with their families.

Mr. BUZEK: Legally, I think there are no difficulties.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do you know whether these men when leaving here made any arrangements for their return.

Mr. BUZEK: I would not be sure on that point.

The CHAIRMAN: These Czechs who have gone back home for their families are not Canadian citizens yet, are they?

Mr. BUZEK: In many cases they are.

The CHAIRMAN: They have been here that long?

Mr. BUZEK: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The representatives of the Canadian Swedish American Alliance have said they would be willing to arrange a bus service, if the Government would arrange to get the people over there.



The CHAIRMAN: Did you see that statement that the representative of the Swedish line made when he said they were willing to put on a bus service?

Mr. BUZEK: No.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: They said they had a limited service for two months now.

Mr. BUZEK: I still feel there will be difficulties with the ocean transportation.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes, but he said they could make their arrangements if they could get the boats.

The CHAIRMAN: You get a hold of Copy No. 4 of our hearings this year. You will find there the statement made about the bus service.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We remember very vividly your excellent presentation last year. At that time we went into the matter to some extent and heard about the success which Czechs and Slovaks had made after coming to Canada. It is not necessary to do so again, but I recall it and wish to mention it in the record.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: You are not including the Ruthenians?

Mr. BUZEK: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We will hear from this other gentleman now.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes. Mr. Koren.

Mr. KOREN: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to repeat what has been said about this situation with regard to Canadians going to Europe. I mean new Canadians. I have seen plenty of people going over to visit their friends and those who decided to stay there was for the reason that they could not get quick action, or perhaps that they thought they might not get their families as soon as they would like to have them here. Most of the new Canadians are 17 years old. The last group arrived in 1930 and that is 17 years separation from their families. That is a long time for anybody.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: I was in Czechoslovakia with Mr. Buzek recently. We are just returned from there. I saw some of the families when I was there. Their fathers are in Canada. As a matter of fact, we visited quite a number of them and they were desperate about their fathers in Canada and asked what is the matter with them that they do not take them over here or why do they not come back and join them there.

The CHAIRMAN: Which families were they? What age would the children be?

Mr. KOREN: They are here 17 years and the children are 17, 18, 20, 24 and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: I see.

Mr. KOREN: In some cases, the father may have been there just before the war and may have recent offspring or something, but those are very few cases. I feel that our new Canadians are really declining here on account of the situation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They are declining in their numbers.

Mr. KOREN: Yes. Their numbers.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: From what we saw in Europe it was pretty badly smashed naturally. I tell you there is lots of work for anybody over there and people coming to visit in Europe and in those countries may find an opportunity for work for all of them. They feel that it may be as well to stay there with their families, as they think it is so hard to get their families into Canada under the

present circumstances. So I was thinking about it from the point of interest of increasing the number of the population in Canada. We seem to lose quite a bit through this situation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Tell me Mr. Koren, what is the situation as far as immigrants leaving Czechoslovakia is concerned and coming to Canada. Will the Government permit it?

Mr. KOREN: It would permit the wives and children up to, I believe, it is 16 years of age, and parents, and wives of course.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: At the time we were over there we asked the Government officials this question and they told us that they needed every man there right now and that they were not in favour of any emigration out of the country.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What would you say are the numbers of the people who have been in there. What is the density of the population? How is land, is it plentiful?

Mr. KOREN: Yes, the eastern part of Slovakia is agricultural.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: The Bohemian part, which is the Czechs, is industry.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: In the agricultural part, are they fairly large farms?

Mr. KOREN: Yes, hundreds of years ago we used to have these large land owners there with thousands of acres of land and so on, but since 1919 it was divided among the people you know.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How is its price?

Mr. KOREN: Price?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes. What can you buy a farm for over there?

Mr. KOREN: The prices there are about the same as here, not on the land of course, but the standard of living.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is what I mean, the land prices.

Mr. KOREN: The land is more expensive because naturally Czechoslovakia has not got the land that Canada has.

The CHAIRMAN: How much an acre does it cost over there?

Mr. KOREN: It would cost up to \$200 an acre for good land.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: They still own the land individually, it is not owned by the state.

Mr. KOREN: No. Some of the confiscated property is owned by the state.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It is leased, it is not sold.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, that is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there a tendency to make it state-owned?

Mr. KOREN: No. I have seen many of our members over there. One will come in once in a while to the office and want to make a deal or something and buy property, they are very small pieces, and so on.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Did you say the Government was opposed to people leaving that country?

Mr. KOREN: Yes, to any of the working classes between the ages of 18 and 50 years.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: What is that again.

Mr. KOREN: The working people between 18 years and 50 years or age.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: They want to keep those people?

Mr. KOREN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Then what is the use of any effort on our part to try and get them over here?

Mr. KOREN: That is it. Last year when we were talking about the possibility of getting families over here, we felt that the Czechoslovak Government would issue passports for members of Canadian families.

The CHAIRMAN: Even though some of the children were over 18 years of age?

Mr. KOREN: Yes, especially the females. There is a big demand for men to work but not very much for females.

The CHAIRMAN: We need the girls.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I do not know if everyone here saw the photograph of the Ottawa family that went back to Czechoslovakia, a man and wife, and at least 10 children.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, ten. We know the family personally.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: He was given quite a send-off by the Ottawa community.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Apparently they can get shipping to leave Canada but not to come to Canada.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes. Your people are much like the Ukrainians who came out and were struck by the depression.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, much the same.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There are certain skilled workers established here who would like very much to get people out from Czechoslovakia.

Mr. KOREN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are there any Czechoslovaks among the displaced persons?

Mr. KOREN: Very few.

The CHAIRMAN: Any in Germany or Austria?

Mr. KOREN: Most of them were returned to Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: While I am here I want to show you the work of a Czech who is in Canada. He is a real artist.

(Examples of ceramic work displayed).

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Tell us, how did you come by these, are they made in Canada?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: This man is now located at Cobourg, and of course he has a demand for far more than he can produce. He was a teacher in this ceramic art in Czechoslovakia before he came to Canada. He has developed a Canadian style.

The CHAIRMAN: Those postures are strikingly accurate.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: He is very good, he cannot turn them out quickly, he is a real artist.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, that is one of the main industries of Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is it?

Mr. KOREN: Yes, there is a big market for these things and we have not nearly enough to supply the demand which there is for them. We saw them when they were being manufactured while we were over there.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: And gloves too.

Mr. KOREN: Yes. Gloves and cut crystal.

The CHAIRMAN: What is that, clay?

Mr. KOREN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Varnished?

Mr. KOREN: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It is glazed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, not varnished.

Hon. Mr. DAIGLE: What would these sell for?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I do not know, but I think he gets \$15.00 apiece for these.

Mr. KOREN: They are all hand made.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Mrs. Cook bought them and I had them in my office.

I have seen some very fine pieces, horses and so on. Eatons and Birks will take everything that he can turn out.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: In that case there is not very much possibility of getting people out from your country, perhaps some female help. The Czechoslovak Government would not allow them passports in any case.

Mr. KOREN: I feel that that is just temporary. We were in Czechoslovakia and saw the great damage which the war did there, and they have to rebuild their roads and bridges and buildings and so on.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There was something like two million Germans moved out.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, there were.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Of course that would leave some space.

Mr. KOREN: Yes, more space for the Slovaks.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: But in any case I think it would be just fair, in case you gentlemen decide to let the immigration in over 18 years, that the same should apply for Czechoslovaks, because when they build up the country again I think that we can get some immigrants from there. For instance, the war caused the loss of 900 bridges blown up in the Slovakian part, 900 of them, the Germans entirely destroyed them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Nice people?

Mr. KOREN: Some of these big bridges are still lying in the river and they have wooden bridges, temporary bridges now. Those have to be rebuilt permanently. We have seen towns levelled out, the whole town, the buildings, the tunnels, the docks, and so on. There is a lot to do. The same in Czechoslovakia as in any other central European country. I think they have need of people right now to build it all up again, but once they are through with that job, I think there would be some people who would like to come over to Canada, and the Government may issue the passports and want them to immigrate here.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Was I right when I said that practically the entire bulk of Czechoslovaks in Canada belong to your organization?

Mr. KOREN: Yes. We have 93 branches across Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are not divided among yourselves.

Mr. KOREN: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: To any great extent at least.

Mr. KOREN: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They are all in the one organization.

Mr. KOREN: One national organization.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is what I mean.

Mr. KOREN: This organization is a charity organization and we were in close co-operation with the Canadian Red Cross throughout the war. I take the opportunity now that I am here, if you will allow me, to say that the



Czechoslovaks were very grateful to Canada, the people of Czechoslovakia and the members of Parliament. President Benes said once when we were visiting him that he would never forget the lovely times he had in Canada while he was here. He was very interested in Canada and said that if he had a chance he would come and would choose Canada for his recreation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I guess that is all we can ask you.

The CHAIRMAN: Here you will see about the bus service.

Mr. KOREN: The bus service as between Czechoslovakia and Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. KOREN: That is already in existence.

The CHAIRMAN: It tells you about it right there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: All we require are more ships.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been wondering if it would be well to place on the record here the number of people from these different countries that are supposed to be in Canada. I have it in a booklet, and if there are no objections I will have it included here on the record immediately following this statement that has been made.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: A recent issue of a booklet entitled "Quick Canadian Facts" gives the following official figures of the origin of people from various countries in Europe who are now in Canada:—

Czechs and Slovaks ..	42,912	Russian .....	83,708
Finnish .....	41,683	Italian .....	112,765
Austrian .....	37,715	Polish .....	167,485
Belgian .....	29,711	Hebrew .....	170,241
Roumanian .....	24,689	Netherlands .....	212,863
Yugoslav .....	21,214	Scandinavian .....	244,603
Greek .....	11,692	Ukranian .....	305,929
Hungarian .....	54,598	German .....	464,682

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Now we have also a representative of the Finnish Advancement Association in Canada, Mr. Sven Spadius. I would like to ask him to speak to us now.

Mr. STADIUS: I had the privilege of appearing before this committee a year ago, and I am certainly very grateful to be here again to answer whatever questions you would like to ask me as far as the Finnish people are concerned. There was another gentleman who was to be here with me to-day, Mr. Kingsley Graham, K.C., who is the Honorary President of our Finnish Advancement Association, and also the Honorary Consul for Finland, but unfortunately serious illness in his immediate family, made it impossible for him to come. I have here with me the brief which he was to read to-day, and he has requested me to read it in his place.

Mr. Chairman and Honourable Senators:

1. I had the opportunity last fall of placing a brief before this Committee and now with the immigration policy being defined, I am happy to amplify that report with a few facts which I trust will be of value to this Honourable Committee.

2. I speak of Scandinavians and particularly of Finns whom I include in the group of Scandinavians, and we all realize that their desire to emigrate is an urge to come to a Country in which a democratic government of a similar type is in operation in their home and believe that the factor of democracy is a magnet drawing them towards this western world. In considering qualifications of immigrants I know that the authorities consider two things, Firstly: and

particularly at this time, what might be called short term immigration, which is a humanitarian approach to a problem in order to provide opportunities of entering Canada to those unfortunate Misplaced Persons who are at present merely existing in Europe by reasons of conditions over which they had no control. Most Canadians realize that these people may in some proportion develop into valuable citizens, although there may be failures because of the unsuitability of some of them to Canadian conditions. As a citizen of the City of Toronto, I say that we have a serious shortage in housing, but our stores and commercial businesses appear adequate for consumer needs. It is therefore desirable that the immigrant shall be one who would be located in new territory rather than one who would add to a situation and a congestion which has been extremely difficult for even our returned veterans with his family. I know we are all in agreement that we should seriously weigh our responsibility of allowing urban entrance, and should consider those who will engage in agricultural pursuits, timber or mining. And in the case of unmarried women, those who would be prepared to accept employment as domestics. It would seem that having regard to all the destruction that has occurred to the European Continent, reallocation of a great number of Misplaced Persons could well be carried out in that area until such times as our own Veterans are properly housed and established in occupations. I believe that Canada has done a marvellous job in this regard of veterans rehabilitation, but I do not agree that it is yet complete, and within a year or two years there will be a great many returned men graduating in trades, sciences and professions whose future welfare should be paramount in your consideration of immigration. Secondly: our long term policy; this is the practical one from the standpoint of Canada's enlargement and development during the next decade. It is respectfully suggested that such immigrants will be those chosen from Countries which have proven themselves adaptable to Canadian ways in years gone by and should be able to give very definite contributions to Canada in years to come. Excepting in a very few instances the Finn and Scandinavian is not under any compulsion to leave his homeland and again with very few exceptions is he a Misplaced Person.

3. Directing our attention therefore to the Finn, we know that in his homeland he is a distinct race related probably in bygone centuries to the Hungarian and Estonian peoples. He speaks a language which is distinctive and has no connection with the Russian language on his east, or the Swedish language on his west. However, there are perhaps 400,000 Swedes on the west coast of Finland who speak Swedish. They have been living in this location for some 300 years and because of this settlement both Swedish and Finnish are the official languages of this democracy.

4. The first immigration of Finns to America occurred in 1641 when they settled in the State of Delaware. Later they began to migrate to Canada as early as 1870 and we estimate that there are between fifty and sixty thousand Finns and Finnish descendants in Canada at the present time. Since 1919 the Republican system of Government was instituted and has continued in Finland. The President is elected for six years and the election is performed by 300 Electors chosen by universal suffrage. Parliament is elected for three years and is composed of 200 members, and members of the Government who are nominated by the President, must have the confidence of the House. Following the last election, and despite the influence and pressure brought to bear by agencies, the election of Communist candidates numbered 24 in the last House and it is believed that an election to-day would result in a substantial reduction of even this minority. About one-half the population derive their livelihood from agriculture and allied pursuits and 70 per cent of the farming population are landowners. Approximately 10 per cent rent their land and the remainder are agricultural labourers. About 75 per cent of the country is forest and the

relation of forest land to area is greater than any other European country. The forests are of great importance in the economic life of the farmers and with their allied industry of pulp and paper contribute the great bulk of Finland's export trade.

5. Finland now has only two large manufacturing centres, Helsinki, and Turku, with populations of about 350,000 and 50,000 respectively. The rest of the country has no large cities, although numerous modern towns of 3,000 and 4,000 population dot its terrain.

6. The Finnish school system has brought about a standard of education whereby all children are taught to read and write, and while higher education and University education is more restricted, nevertheless there is no illiteracy, and professional and trade schools are adequately provided.

7. In Canada the Finn is found largely in Northern Ontario, Northern Quebec, and in the woods of British Columbia. There are however some minor settlements in our western states where the Finn engages in agriculture and they are also found in the mines of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. In the mining cities of Sudbury, Kirkland Lake and Timmins, Ontario, the Finn has proved himself a good worker in our development of mines. In the lumber camps of Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia he has entered into the type of work in which he engaged in his homeland. During the difficult times of 1932 and 1939, the Finn showed himself adaptable by turning his hand to trades of carpentry and agriculture with the result that a very small proportion of Finns were found to require state assistance to make a living. In his native land prior to the war they had a standard of living considered extremely high for a non-manufacturing nation. Music and the arts were emphasized and sports and education were insisted upon with the result that up to 1938 they were considered one of the most progressive and decent democracies in Europe.

8. Following the second Russian war they lost a substantial proportion of their territory in Karelia and some 350,000 Finns were forced to migrate on a few days' notice with such equipment and furnishings as they could carry with them. Shortly before this the German Army in retreat had devastated Lapland by burning homes and barns throughout the country. Finland was therefore faced with the necessity of re-allocating some 360,000 people as well as repairing the homes and the farms that were destroyed. In addition, she had reparations to pay of some \$400,000,000 which were to be paid in goods calculated at the 1938 level of prices and lost the largest Nickel Mine in Europe at Petsamo, together with the fine harbour and all that involved in the way of trade and commerce. She has nevertheless made such sacrifices that the terms are being adhered to and no excuse has yet been found by any country to occupy her territory and she is putting up a valiant effort to maintain her democratic system of Government. She is the keystone in Scandinavia between the Communist idealism on the one side and the Democratic Kingdoms of Sweden, Norway and Denmark to the west.

9. In Finland there are some few residents who having relatives or intimate friends in Canada, desire to come to this Dominion. Their friends and relatives in Canada are prepared to pay their passage out and to put up guarantees as to work and subsistence which would be adequate guarantee that these people will never become a charge on the country. On arrival if they were admitted to our land they would actively engage in mining, lumbering and agriculture. Unmarried women would engage in domestic work in which they have been adept in the past, and it would be found I believe that married couples with families would homestead in the west and carve out new homes in the forests in Northern Ontario. I am convinced they would be quite as fine citizens as those Finns who have preceded them and would adapt themselves to our form of Government, which is in effect the same as their own.



10. Finland's spiritual culture has always been subject to strong influence from Scandinavia, which has likewise with Great Britain had a marked affect upon the Finnish economic life. Prior to the war Great Britain was Finland's largest customer.

11. Naturally, the Government of Finland, with so much work before them is not urging immigration upon its people, nevertheless as a democratic country it would probably grant the privilege to some of its citizens at any rate to come to Canada if they were invited at this time. A year ago there would have been no hesitation on the part of Finland to permit migration. To-day they are not urging them, but on the contrary they are definitely proposing to restrict their citizens leaving the country.

12. Our immigration policy does not permit Finns to come to Canada at this time on the ground they are still alien enemies. Yet Finland never fired a shot at a Canadian soldier and the Finns in Canada volunteered and fought for Canada in the recent war. I do not propose to take up the problem of whether Finland was justified in attempting to retrieve that territory taken by Russia in the winter of 1940 and 1941, but I shall quote the pledge of a Finnish-Canadian lad, William Arthur Erikson, R.C.A.F., born in Helsinki, whose family settled at Schomberg, Ontario—"My Finnish Canadian brothers and I have enjoyed living under the British flag, the emblem of liberty. Britain today is holding the fort for freedom. We stand united with our Anglo-Saxon comrades. I give you the pledge of my Finnish Canadian brothers that we will all work with you, unafraid, with regard to sacrifice, toward the liberation of the world and ultimate victory." This was given in a "Canadians All", series of radio programs over the C.B.C.

13. I have attempted to explain briefly the reason for my belief that Finns should be excepted from the stigma of enemy aliens by an "Order in Council" if necessary, and that by reason of their adaptability and their initiative in developing our mines, lumber limits, and our agricultural limits, we should welcome them as a proper type in our immigration laws now being framed.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

KINGSLEY GRAHAM,

*Honorary Consul for the Republic of Finland.*

TORONTO, May 6, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a very interesting statement.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And endorsed by yourself?

Mr. STADIUS: And endorsed by myself.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It contains a lot of information. I notice it says that Russia imposed a most severe peace. I believe they also required that the Finns turn around, in their weakened condition, and fight the German army. The Germans then in revenge burnt every village they passed through and destroyed everything as they went out of the country.

Mr. STADIUS: That is so.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: And they were also fined five per cent a month or some such amount for any delays in payment which they were required to make to Russia in money or goods. They could not get the goods because of strikes in the United States, so their debt was added to by hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars.

Mr. STADIUS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: We had before us last year a man from Finland,—though I would not say that Finland contains any greater proportion of these



people than any other country—who quite openly admitted that he was not satisfied with the Canadian form of government; he was a Communist. I do not remember whether you were here at the same time.

Mr. STADIUS: Yes. I was here at the same time.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I could not but admire his frankness, anyway.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: As I understand the situation in this alien enemy picture, it will continue, unless the order in council is revoked, until the peace treaties are signed.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Did we not ratify the peace treaties, including the treaty with Finland? I thought it passed our house the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. We have before us the Finnish peace treaty and several others.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They were laid on the table yesterday.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Would not that automatically abrogate the status of enemy alien?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I suppose the treaty is not effective until we approve of it.

The CHAIRMAN: That is something we ought to find out, by question or otherwise. If the status of enemy alien continues in spite of the treaty, the committee ought to sign a request to the government that, as far as the Finns and possibly some others are concerned, they should no longer be regarded as "enemy aliens" under the immigration requirements.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes. Let us get somebody from the External Affairs Department to tell us what the picture actually is with regard to these peace treaties.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: May I add a couple of personal remarks which were not included in the brief, but which have been discussed and have been of concern to the Finnish people here lately? One of them is just this question of still being considered as enemy aliens. The Immigration Branch does not pass on any Finnish case at the present time, as you will have seen from the figures submitted by Mr. Jolliffe when he appeared here. I saw from these figures that in 1946 only seven Finns were admitted into the country, and they must have been very special cases. I understand that at the present time only wives and minor children are considered; the rest are out of the picture completely; yet there are, even to my personal knowledge, a number of very very, good cases of persons who would make excellent settlers and are willing to come here; they have relatives here who are willing to provide them not only with accommodation but arrange work for them on farms and up in the lumber camps and so on; yet at the present time they cannot be admitted, partly because they are regarded as enemy aliens, and partly because it is said that proper medical examination cannot take place, that there are no medical facilities in Finland, and these people cannot leave Finland unless they first have the approval of the Canadian government to come to Canada. But our government, that is the Canadian government, have facilities in the Scandinavian countries through the legations and consulates in Norway, Denmark and Sweden; and we feel that if the Finnish people can find their way to any of these countries they should be permitted to appear before Canadian authorities in Sweden, Norway or Denmark, and then proceed from there.

It was also stated in the brief that comparatively only a small number probably will be permitted to leave the country, because there is much rebuilding to be done in Finland, as in many other European countries, and emigration

is not encouraged at the present time. Therefore there would be no risk so far as Canada is concerned of the whole population moving over from Finland into Canada; and the fact that Canada grants someone permission to enter this country does not necessarily mean that that person will actually be able to come here. The final say-so would be on the other side, whether the passport would be granted or not. But I feel that the people generally would feel a great deal better if permission were granted. Then it would not be the Canadian government's fault if the people could not leave the other side. And as I have said, it would be a comparatively small number who would be coming. There are not so many who have the means. Probably they will not be able to take any of their property out of the country when they leave. The applications, as I said, will be comparatively few.

There is another angle entering into this immigration policy and that is the United States. Their quota for Finland for the coming year is 570. That is based on old figures of these immigration quotas which have never been changed. Therefore the maximum number that can enter the United States from Finland in the year commencing July 1, is 570.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Has the United States considered them alien enemies, as we do?

Mr. STADIUS: No, they have not. According to the immigration laws they are admissible provided the quota is not filled.

The CHAIRMAN: And that has been the quota figure for a number of years?

Mr. STADIUS: As far back as I remember. And I understand, they give preference to Finnish people from the other side rather than Finn residents from some other country outside Finland itself. They try to give preference to Finns in Finland ahead of anyone else.

There is one more point, and that is that, so far, in the immigration policy we have considered only manual labourers, primarily. That is, we have considered brawn rather than brain; and while brawn is needed to develop this country nevertheless there will always be a few intellectuals who would like to come to Canada.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Sometimes I think we have a greater need for brain than we have for brawn.

Mr. STADIUS: There is something to be said for that. Certainly, the immigration of brain has not been encouraged. In the United States—again—they are grabbing everyone they can lay their hands on. If any of the outstanding intellectuals of Europe desire to come to the United States they are accepted with open arms, whereas we keep them out because of some technicalities; they are not willing to go on the farms or in the mines, or something like that. We believe that this is definitely a mistake. They will be very few in number; but where persons of that calibre desire to enter this country I think we should give them every facility to come because they can only enrich this country, and we would have nothing to lose by their presence.

The CHAIRMAN: Might I ask, what is your normal occupation?

Mr. STADIUS: My normal occupation? In peace time I was associated with Mr. Graham as honorary vice consul for Finland at the Finnish Consulate. Now, of course, both Mr. Graham and myself are technically, so to speak, in the "dog house", if I may say so. I am associated with the Royal Swedish Consulate, looking after their Finnish interests.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Cannot a Finn be given a medical examination in his own country?

Mr. STADIUS: The Canadian authorities have no facilities in Finland at the present time.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Oh, it is the Canadian authorities?

Mr. STADIUS: It is the Canadian authorities, yes.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I read an article in the *Readers' Digest* by a man who very recently visited Finland, and I thought there is no country which is making such an heroic effort to maintain its freedom. They have no eight-hour day there; they are working—men, women and children—eighteen hours a day to pay their debts and maintain their independence. I think it is a wonderful story of a people setting to work; and I think that if some other countries do not do a little more work they will perhaps lose their independence. The Finns are determined to pay off what is, for a small country, an enormous debt. Although they have lost a lot of their valuable land, they are determined to meet their liabilities and maintain their independence as a nation.

Mr. STADIUS: I had an opportunity of translating a letter the other day for a Canadian firm in Toronto which was sending parcels to orphan children in Finland. The guardian of these people wrote a letter to this firm and I translated it for them. This person says in that letter, in regard to the future of Finland, that the outlook at the present time is rather gloomy, but, she says, "We do not want to give up. We intend to pay our obligations that we have signed to the last penny, and after that we can look forward to a happier future." I think that is very typical of the state of mind which prevails in Finland at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, sir.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: A splendid statement, Mr. Stadius.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that is all for to-day. Next Wednesday we shall have before us the Trades and Labour Council of Canada, and also the Canadian Congress of Labour; we hope, also, Dr. Herbert Marshall, who is the government statistician, to deal with certain figures. I presume that this is all for to-day.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is all for to-day, and that is correct as to the evidence next week. On the 15th the representatives of the C.N.R. will be here, and Mr. Leclair of the Lumbermen's Association.

The committee adjourned until Wednesday, May 14, 1947.







90-Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

*Canada Immigration and Labour  
Standing Committee 1947*

1947

(THE SENATE OF CANADA)



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 8

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

WITNESSES:

- Mr. Percy R. Bengough, President, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.
- Mr. John W. Buckley, Secretary-Treasurer, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.
- Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research, Canadian Congress of Labour.
- Mr. Pat Conroy, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour.
- Mr. Herbert Marshall, Dominion Statistician, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947





## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 14th May, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Buchanan, Crerar, Daigle, Horner, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck and Wilson, 10.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Mr. Percy R. Bengough, President, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, appeared and read a brief on Immigration on the behalf of the Congress, and was questioned.

Mr. John W. Buckley, Secretary-Treasurer, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, was heard with respect to immigration to Canada.

Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research, Canadian Congress of Labour, appeared and read a Memorandum on Immigration prepared by him and submitted on behalf of the Canadian Congress of Labour, and was questioned.

Mr. Pat Conroy, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour, was heard in favour of immigration to Canada and advocated an improved immigration policy for Canada.

Mr. Herbert Marshall, Dominion Statistician, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, appeared and read a brief on Absorptive Capacity in Relation to Immigration Policy, and was questioned.

The Honourable Senator Buchanan presented a submission by Alberta Sugar Beet Growers Association and Canadian Sugar Factories Ltd., on Labour Requirements for Sugar Beet Growing in Southern Alberta, which was ordered to be printed in the record.

At 1 o'clock, p.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday, June 4, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Who is the first witness?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I may as well say something about the program. We have this morning representatives of Labour, and we have also the Dominion Statistician. We always call the lay witnesses first; and here we have Mr. Percy R. Bengough, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. John W. Buckley, the Secretary-Treasurer; and Mr. Arthur E. Hemming, Associate Secretary-Treasurer. Mr. Mosher, President of the Canadian Congress of Labour, has found it impossible to come; but we have with us the Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Pat Conroy; and we have the Director of Research, Mr. E. A. Forsey. I think the natural thing would be to call the labour representatives first; and I would suggest that Mr. Bengough, as President of the Trades and Labour Congress, be invited to address us.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well, Mr. Bengough.

Mr. PERCY R. BENGOUGH: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have no change or very little change in the presentation. It is practically a reiteration of what we presented here last year. Since we met this Committee and presented a memorandum we have had a convention, and the memorandum we presented to you was endorsed without change. So, as I say, it is really a repetition.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I would rather call it a re-affirmation.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Yes. This is our statement:

May 14, 1947.

To the Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., and

Honourable Members of the Standing Committee on  
Immigration and Labour of The Senate of Canada.

HONOURABLE SENATORS;—On behalf of The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada we are very pleased to again have the opportunity of placing before you our views on the all important question of immigration.

We recognize the need of a sound immigration policy, a policy that will, at all times, adhere to the need of selection and "the exclusion of all races that cannot be properly assimilated into the national life of Canada." This has been for many years, and still is, included in the Platform of Principles of The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.

It must be recognized that there are citizens of other countries who may be good brothers and sisters, internationally, but yet would not be acceptable as brothers- and sisters-in-law to Canadians. Experience has clearly demonstrated that because of this fact certain nationals who have in the past been admitted into Canada remain as a distinct race and will remain a problem for future generations. The result of permitting such an immigration policy has been equally unfair to those admitted and to their children, as to the citizens of Canada generally. Organized Labour naturally opposed such immigration for



the fact that such immigrants came and for many years remained a reservoir of cheap labour and a menace to Canadian standards of living. Any system of selection must include the suitability of assimilation, and must, in the best interests of all, be rigidly adhered to. We strongly advocate that immigration should be handled exclusively by Government and not left to private enterprise.

At the convention of this Congress, held in the city of Toronto, September, 1944, the Standing Committee on Post-War Rehabilitation reported as follows:—

Whether we in Canada are prepared to adopt a progressive immigration policy is a matter of vital concern. We cannot ignore the fact of the wonderful productive advantages of our industries, agriculture and our valuable natural resources and in our judgment we should be willing to accept selected people only in such degrees that they can be absorbed and do not vitally affect the general welfare of our own citizens and that full employment and security are assured to all before any attempts are made to remove existing restrictions.

This was unanimously endorsed at that convention and, as no changes were made at our 1946 convention, represents the present day views of this Congress on this question, with the inclusion of more recognition to the need of proper housing. We might add that there is a general recognition that this country could and should maintain a far larger population than we have at present. In face of the future prospects of less export trade as a result of the improvements made in importing countries both agriculturally and industrially, Canadians must, of necessity, give more attention to the development of Canada and to their home market, which is possible only if our people are gainfully employed with a buying power in balance with their ability to produce. Unquestionably a larger population would mean more customers both for the manufacturer and the merchant; neither can we overlook the fact that twelve million people are not sufficient to hold such a country as Canada, so rich in natural resources, indefinitely.

In conclusion, we wish to again leave this thought with this Committee: The problem of securing selected immigrants is no less than the one of how to retain them as citizens. Some claiming to be informed have stated that the natural birth increase from the time of Confederation would have resulted in a population equal to the present. If such were true, then all results of past immigration have been of little benefit.

A five year survey conducted on the Pacific Coast a few years ago did show that fifty per cent of our building trades mechanics had taken employment in the United States. Many of them, undoubtedly immigrants trained in Canada to our construction methods, went to the United States as first class workmen. The same applies to thousands of our apprentices, our working population and to the graduates of our universities. While Canada can supply the education and meet the cost of training artisans and scientists, we have not yet found the answer to providing them with a standard of living sufficient to retain their services, so necessary to the building and development of this great country. Until means are found to retain our ablest and brightest citizens, the looking for new immigrants to educate, train and lose is not so important. On the face of it our first job is to repair the container, then pour in the new immigrants.

(Signed) PERCY R. BENGOUGH,  
*President,*

JOHN W. BUCKLEY,  
*Secretary-Treasurer,*

ARTHUR E. HEMMING,  
*Associate Secretary-Treasurer,*  
The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions, gentlemen?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: So that the real problem, Mr. Bengough, is an economic one.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Economic, I would say, yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: At the foot of the first page of your brief I find the following: "We strongly advocate that immigration should be handled exclusively by government and not left to private enterprise." Just what is the meaning of that?

Mr. BENGOUGH: We think that the government should assume the full responsibility, in the same manner as, shall I say, the Australian government is doing at the present time.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I speak subject to correction, but my impression is that the Australian government are paying the passage or part of the passage of immigrants to Australia. At any rate, they are finding ships for them.

Mr. BENGOUGH: They are finding ships. They are really conducting the whole of it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes; but what I am getting at is this. Have you in mind here what is generally termed "assisted immigration", that is, assistance by paying the cost of passages?

Mr. BENGOUGH: Well, frankly, we are opposed to assisted immigration when conducted by private enterprise, and to the bringing in of people under false pretenses as has been done in the past.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I wholly agree with that, if what you have in mind is what happened fifty years ago. However, when you speak of private enterprise I wonder if you have in mind a condition such as, for example, the Mennonites in Canada and the United States being willing to pay the fares of Mennonites who are in the displaced persons or refugee camps in the British and American zones of Germany? Would you call it private enterprise to bring them here? They are doing it from a humanitarian point of view and also for the good work that they could do here.

Mr. BENGOUGH: I was thinking of the Doukhobors in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: To my recollection they were brought out by the government.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Were their passages paid?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: No, but they were brought out by the government.

Mr. BENGOUGH: I think the C.P.R. was in on it too.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: If I recall correctly, at that time the transportation companies gave very low rates, and it is not in my memory that they brought them in free. The point that I am getting at is that I am wholly opposed to that type of immigration. My views are probably much wider than what you have expressed here, Mr. Bengough, and I think the government's part is to examine people and see that they have a proper physical and mental standard, and that they conform to our requirements so far as health is concerned.

Mr. BENGOUGH: And to give them the right information.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Yes, I would agree to that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We do not want to give them the wrong information.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Was it not Colonel Barr who brought out some immigrants at one time to Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is the Barr colony.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Yes. The Barr colony, as I recall it, was an adventure of an enthusiast.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What was the matter with that? Eventually it was a huge success. Many outstanding men have performed wonders for agriculture in Canada who came from that colony.

Mr. BENGOUGH: After many years.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Oh, not so many years. I can mention many successful men, some of whom have taken prizes for livestock and grain. I would say that it was a huge success. Take the number of native Canadians who were raised in families here and see how many of them were failures. One man from a family will pay income tax while his brother will have to be supported by the government. I think that scheme was a huge success by and large.

The CHAIRMAN: How many years ago was that?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: 1903.

Mr. BENGOUGH: I have never had it presented to me in that way. I know it developed some as time went on, but frankly I am of the impression that, although to a few it was a huge success, there were numbers of failures and tragedies that came out of it.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What tragedies?

Mr. BENGOUGH: There were people there who went broke and most of them had to leave.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There were no tragedies. They all merged into the general settlement of western Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: About how many were involved?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: There were a few hundred.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, do both you gentlemen not agree that while the colony may in forty years have been a success, that it is no reason that we repeat the evil features of the enterprise but that we should learn from the wise features. ●

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: My recollection in connection with the Barr colony is that a great many of them had never had any acquaintance with agriculture when they came out here in the first place. Mr. Bengough, when you speak of private enterprise I imagine you have in mind something about the railways.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Mainly yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: A few years ago the C.N.R. brought out a large group of Mennonites from Russia to the country where I live, and they advanced their steamship fares, and those fares were paid back. I do not know personally of one failure among those people who were brought out at that time. They were all agriculturists and they went on the land and stayed there, whereas in the case of the Barr colonists those people were made up of all types of people and if they did not know anything about farming and were placed on the land anywhere in Canada they were bound to be failures because of lack of experience.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I think that was the main difficulty with the Barr colonists.

Mr. BENGOUGH: It was misrepresented to them.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Not by the government or the transportation companies. It was a sort of an idealistic adventure of a preacher, an Anglican clergyman. He had sentimental and other reasons, and it was not a practical scheme. However, what I had in mind was that in the autumn of 1938, after Germany annexed the Sudeten area in Czechoslovakia, the so-called Sudeten Germans who were loyal to Czechoslovakia had to get out with what they could carry in their hand. Their plight was very difficult and a delegation came to Ottawa in November of 1938 to see if it would be possible to have a few hundred families of these displaced persons brought to Canada. As I recall



it, both the French and the British governments advanced money to the people for that purpose. Altogether there were several hundred families brought to Canada, and one group settled at Tupper Creek in northeastern British Columbia while the other group settled at Walberg in Saskatchewan. The Canadian Pacific Railway more or less sponsored the first group and the Canadian National Railways the second group. Very few of them were agriculturalists and they had some problems to begin with, the same as the pioneers who first went into western Canada. The net result was that, while probably 20 per cent of the Tupper Creek group got out and got into the stream of one kind of labour and another—one of them is an editor of a newspaper now—the other 80 per cent remained. They have got their individual farms and are producing good crop now, and I do not know of any other group in Canada which has made as much progress as this group has made. They are producing livestock and grain and are buying refrigerators, washing machines, furniture and all the necessities of life, and they will increase their purchases as their producing power extends. Culturally they have been a success. What would be your views, Mr. Bengough, to a similar proposal, if it were advanced today?

Mr. BENGOUGH: I do not know. It would have to be judged on its merits. I do not know if it would raise general objections.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I might state my general theory and see if you agree with it. Fifty years ago Canada adopted what was called a vigorous immigration policy, and for the following fifteen years immigrants were brought into this country in larger numbers, one year the figures reached as high as four hundred thousand, as I recall it. These people came mainly from Europe and that was really the commencement of our Ukrainian immigration into Canada. As well as the Ukrainians, many Germans and many Polish came and there was also quite a large number of immigrants from the United States. As a result of that immigration the whole prairie country was opened up. Railroads were built, towns and villages were built, schools and churches were built and all the amenities of life in Canada were established. The total amount of wealth that was produced in the prairie provinces as a result of that immigration has run into colossal figures. It is not too much to say that it was through the development that followed that immigration, and the wealth that was produced from it, that Canada was able to play the part she did in the first and second world wars. Would you say, Mr. Bengough, that that was a mistake?

Mr. BENGOUGH: No, it has been shown that it was not.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Well, knowing that the same opportunity exists today—and my argument is that it does exist because Canada is still a frontier to develop—would it not be reasonable to expect that a similar expansion of production in Canada would take place with general benefit to all the people.

Mr. BENGOUGH: We say that.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Perhaps I may be mistaken, Mr. Bengough, but I rather felt that the view of your organization is that immigrants should not be brought to Canada until there is some assurance of work for them. Now, if that principle had been applied fifty years ago we would not have brought these people to Canada.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: If that principle had been applied then we would never have had an immigrant.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Well, we would not have brought these people in because there were more people out of work at that time in Canada than there have been since.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I did not think the witness meant that. I think Mr. Bengough means that we must not bring people to Canada who will be out of work. Those immigrants of whom you spoke were not out of work.

Mr. BENGOUGH: No, they went on the land.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Do you not think that, like the United States with a population of 140,000,000, Canada would benefit by having greater opportunities and a greater home market because of a larger population in this vast country of ours.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Yes, definitely; but in the meantime I think more thought has to be given to the standard of living.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What do you mean by "the standard of living"?

Mr. BENGOUGH: The amount of money that people receive and what they can buy with it.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It all depends on what the individual does with his money. I maintain that men with a five-cent piece in their pockets can go out in this country and do well. I heard a man with one leg say if he could take a five-cent piece he could go out and come back in ten years with \$10,000. This whole question of standard of living annoys me, because one cannot measure it by any yardstick I know of. How can you measure the standard of living, and leave the individual with a free choice of what he does with his money?

Mr. Chairman, since the Barr colonists have been mentioned I should like to hear the other side. I think it would be wise to have one of the original Colonists appear before this committee and tell us what they did for Canada, badly managed as they were at the start.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Senator Horner knows these persons—

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I know several of them.

Mr. BENGOUGH: If you picked one of the lucky ones would you get a true picture?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Mr. Bengough, is there a shortage of labour in certain occupations throughout Canada?

Mr. BENGOUGH: There is, yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I frequently am told that there are not enough men to supply the tailoring business. I did not make any inquiries to ascertain whether that was the true picture. I also heard that there was a shortage in the needle trade.

The CHAIRMAN: And in the sugar beet industry.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: That is agricultural labour.

Mr. BENGOUGH: It is seasonal.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: There is a shortage in the sugar beet industry. But is there a definite shortage, Mr. Bengough, in some occupations?

Mr. BENGOUGH: Yes, there is.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: That shortage cannot be filled out of our own population.

Mr. BENGOUGH: We could do with mechanics in many lines.

Mr. BUCHANAN: What about the building trades?

Mr. BENGOUGH: There are some branches of the building trades that would really welcome mechanics; they would prefer to have them come from the British Isles but there is a shortage in that country, and they are required there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Bengough, I wish you had not held your hand in preparing this document. You bring the question up to a certain point, and

drop it. You say that our problem is an economic one, that the buying power shall balance with the ability to produce, and you raise the suggestion of an economic difficulty, but you do not go on in any way to say what you actually mean and what difficulties are to be overcome. Are we to scrap our system and become like Russia or something like that?

Mr. BENGOUGH: I never suggested that, of course.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: No, you did not.

Mr. BENGOUGH: There is no thought of that nature behind it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What was in your mind? What should we do to make it possible to populate this country? I suppose you and I agree that we have resources that should produce employment.

Mr. BENGOUGH: That should be developed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They should be developed and are equal to supporting a very much larger population than we now have.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Definitely.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But somehow or other there is a stalemate between the application of our labour to natural resources, and the getting of labour into production of the resources. What is the matter with us?

Mr. BENGOUGH: Well, we say that we have not got the money.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You do not believe that, do you, after the last war? There is plenty of money.

Mr. BENGOUGH: Of course, we did not go into that question here, but we feel that the money could be found and that the country could be developed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You think it is a matter of capital for the development of resources?

Mr. BENGOUGH: Well, if you put up a building, once it is up the national wealth of the country has been enhanced by that amount.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what you mean, Mr. Bengough, by the sentence: "We strongly advocate that immigration should be handled exclusively by government and not left to private enterprise."

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I think that is another thought that Mr. Bengough had in mind, and is different from the one I am attempting to delve into. Of course I have my own ideas, and I do not hesitate to express them. I think our resources are monopolized and held at too high a price and not used. I know how I would correct the problem if I had my own way.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What resources do you refer to?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I refer to them all.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What ones?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Land, mines, forests; when we speak of natural resources we mean the gifts of nature.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I do not think land should be included.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, I do. Go out and try to buy it at a price that will be profitable today.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: You can buy land today at less than the value of the buildings and fences on it. The C.P.R. has land for sale that I consider cheaper than my homestead at \$10; it is near the railway and is for sale as low as \$5 and \$6 an acre. It is not held out of reach of industrial farmers. Stories are told of a man buying land and putting in one crop of flax, and paying for the property in one year.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are taking the cheapest natural resource we have: farm land on the border of cultivation.

Mr. BENGOUGH: I do not think we could say that we had developed our mining resources to their full extent.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We certainly cannot say that, and it is perfectly obvious why. We have made it so difficult to stake and hold a claim that it costs the prospector a thousand dollars a claim; then when it passes under a patent we tax him 5 cents an acre. In the province of Ontario there are large tracts of mining land held undeveloped. Most of the nickel in the world is held by one company which pays a mere pittance in taxation.

Mr. BENGOUGH: And is kept idle.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Go and try to make a mine out of it and see what will happen; you will then know whether the natural resources are over-valued and held at a price that they cannot be used. You will find that they are so held.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that I subscribe altogether to that view. For instance the federal government, and also the provincial governments, through their geological surveys are steadily expanding information about the geology of the country. They are making maps that are a guide to the prospector with the spirit of adventure and the desire to strike it rich. The number of recorded claims in the past few years is greater than in any other similar period in our history. That is a good thing. For instance in Manitoba, the province with which I am most familiar, there are today prospects of the development of very large copper and nickel property in the northern part of that province. That is all to the good.

We in Canada are in the position where we have many of these commercial metals, as they are called, which are just as essential to modern civilization as is food. The telephone, the motor-car and electrical development are on an ever-expanding scale and require these metals. There may be a difference of opinion as to the form in which the development should take place; personally, I think it would be impossible for the government to do all these things; the political pressure that would come upon it would be very great. The point I am concerned with is the general question of immigration.

I recall when the Ukrainians were brought to Canada fifty years ago that they went mainly to the western provinces and were settled largely on the land. I recall these poor people who arrived without any capital, and with very little goods. I could take you, Mr. Bengough, to community after community in Manitoba and show you where they went into the rough country, built huts of logs and mud, with mud ovens and scarcely any furniture excepting home-made stuff, and with no floors in their cabins.

Mr. BENGOUGH: We should not expect them to do that today.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Why not?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: May I finish my remarks? You can go into that community today and find some homes electrically lighted. These people are purchasing every year the products of labour in Canada in some form or another. I think that was a good development, and I would not stall it today, Mr. Bengough, simply because the people could not start at a higher level than they started at that time. They will make progress, and as they do so, they will produce new wealth and become consuming entities; they will give employment to labour all over the country; they give employment to railways in the hauling of their goods; they buy the products of labour in every form. May I point out that a similar development can take place in Canada today, but it will not take place if we are going to set a standard and say that no one can come here unless there is a job assured to him, and we will not allow him to come without a certain amount of capital.



The CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt to point out that we have a number of distinguished people here, and that the Senators might argue this point after the meeting.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: May I add one more thought to what Senator Crerar and Senator Roebuck have said? The problem today is that the government has interfered with the credit procedure. The sons of these people have attended universities and now the farms are for sale, and because of government regulations in the matter of collections they are offered for sale for cash; otherwise they would be for sale without a dollar down, the same as they were forty years ago.

Mr. BENGOUGH: I should like to make one observation if I may. In our opinion there is a tremendous amount of work to be done in Canada, in the matter of building of arterial highways, roads, reforestation and electrification of rural areas, and all that represents employment that should be entered into. Many thousands could be brought in and given employment.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I suppose we had better take the one group first, and then turn to the next group. Mr. Buckley is the secretary-treasurer of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, Mr. Bengough's organization.

The CHAIRMAN: This is Mr. Buckley, also of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada?

Mr. JOHN W. BUCKLEY: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: You have a statement to make to us?

Mr. BUCKLEY: No, I have no statement, at least nothing more than was embodied in Mr. Bengough's statement. If there are any questions to ask I shall be glad to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN: I am quite sure that the committee will give earnest consideration to the presentation which has been made on behalf of your organization; and possibly there will be some arguments later in the matter. But this morning, as you see, we have several other people to come before us; and unless you have some additional statement to make—

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I know, as a matter of fact, Mr. Buckley has some very pregnant opinions on this question of immigration, because I have heard him express them; and if he would take ten or fifteen minutes to give us his thought, which is old and matured, we would be obliged to him.

The CHAIRMAN: Not forgetting please, Mr. Buckley, that we have here in Canada a larger country than the United States and 120,000,000 less inhabitants.

Mr. BUCKLEY: I agree with what you say. In fact, as Mr. Roebuck has stated, I recall that when he and I were on a radio programme on a national hook-up, we did not differ very much in regard to the whole subject matter.

I have not prepared anything here, because I did not expect to be called upon. I, like Mr. Bengough, can speak as an immigrant. I did come out at a time when there was unexampled prosperity, that is in the year 1906, although the following year I found a condition whereby we ran into a depression, and unemployment was very severe, followed by the financial panic of about 1910.

So far as immigration is concerned, I am in perfect accord with what has been stated by President Bengough, and was stated over the radio, and appeared in the *Monetary Times* in a debate, that this country could maintain a population of 200,000,000 people if it was properly constituted. In making that statement I do not think it is an exaggeration, because of the fact that Canada is practically in the temperate zone. Toronto is 600 miles nearer the Equator than London, England, and many of the large European countries are situated in the latitude of Labrador.



The fact is, however as I have previously stated, that Canada is a country in which we have been doing the spade work in bringing immigrants in, and, due to our close proximity to the United States, those immigrants, as has been the case with the professional classes, have migrated because opportunities were better across the line and that meant a higher standard of living for those who migrated to the United States prior to the quota law being put in operation, as of 1924. I might mention that the quota law of the United States was instituted at the request of the American Federation of Labour. In 1923 President Coolidge came into office. I was a delegate to the Portland Convention of the American Federation of Labour and this matter was brought up at that meeting; and the subject was brought up there, and a quota law afterwards became operative, because they considered they were being over-populated to the extent that they could not assimilate immigrants as they had done in the nineteenth century. The consequence of the migration has been, however, so far as Canada is concerned, that the question arises how are we to retain what we get? That, to me, is the real issue. Certainly there has been, as stated here—I have read your reports in *Hansard*—a large immigration of potential inhabitants, and of course, people are the only real asset of a country. The natural wealth of a country does not consist of its forests, mines and other natural resources; it is the population which develops it, because wealth consists of labour applied to natural resources.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Right.

Mr. BUCKLEY: The foundation of the whole set-up is this: the question of the standard of living. We know that the Irishman lives on the potato, because that is the cheapest form of food. We know that the Scotsman lives on oatmeal, because that is the cheapest form of nutriment. We know that the Asiatic lives on rice, because that is the cheapest form of food. In England we live on roast beef, when we can get it. But the question of the maintenance of immigration is dependent on the standard of living in this country today. That is the position so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ROEBUCK: You mean, how it affects the standard of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY: How it affects the standard of living of the worker. We know that this country could provide a higher standard of living than it does today; that is, if our potential wealth were properly developed; and I believe that that is the fundamental question in this connection.

We have also referred to the point that immigration should be handled exclusively by government and not let to private enterprise. We read in the press of recent date of a permit being given to an employer of labour to go to Europe in order to get textile workers. I am informed only this morning that several more permits have been given. It seems very peculiar that permits should be given at a time when there is a textile strike. We contend that it should not be open to an employer to get permits. The government should first ascertain if there is a shortage of labour in this country before other workers are brought in. We know that in the legal and other professions people are not allowed in from abroad to practise law merely because they have the professional qualifications. If the immigrant is a lawyer, he is required first to join a bar association. As far as labour is concerned we do not put that condition upon those who come to this country who have served as mechanics abroad. If an immigrant is really qualified he is immediately allowed in our organizations. We do not put up any bar against him as far as immigration and employment are concerned.

I believe that our country is under-populated, and that if we could find some means whereby our population could be increased in line with our potentialities, Canada would become a greater country. We cannot hope to hold it with only 12 millions of a population. We are between two imperialist nations, and at

present we are in a position that we cannot defend our own country. The only law applicable to our position is the right of conquest. It is by conquest we got it, and that is how it can be taken from us.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Tell us what Russia has been doing in her northern stretches.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Well, as far as Russia is concerned, I have been there, but that does not make me a communist, because I was only there one month; and I have been in this country 40 years, and I am not a communist yet.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There was no such implication in my question.

Mr. BUCKLEY: I have found that Russia has a population of a million people in the Arctic zones. They have developed their Arctic; they are developing their natural resources; they are developing their fisheries; they are finding out that they can grow wheat even in the Arctic Circle; whereas I think about as far north as we have gone is Edmonton. But the area which we call northern Labrador and St. James Bay is no farther north than Leningrad and some other northern Russian cities. It is that upon which I am basing my calculation of 200 million people; that we are in practically the same position as the northern part of Europe.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What do the Russians use for labour in developing their Arctic? Slave labour.

Mr. BUCKLEY: As far as I am concerned, I was not in the Arctic. I did not find slave labour where I went. I am not questioning that there is slave labour in Russia,—what you would call slave labour. We know that even under the Czars they had what you call slave labour in Siberia, people whom they sent there. But I am not prepared to say that in the development of their natural resources the Russians are using only slave labour.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You were saying that you are in favour of trained men coming to Canada.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Is it not a fact that most of the artisans in our building trades are men trained in England, that they form the backbone of our force of bricklayers, carpenters and others?

Mr. BUCKLEY: It has been so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But they are all immigrants?

Mr. BUCKLEY: The union movement here has been identified with the fact that the majority of the artisans did come from the old country, and that practically all the carpenters, machinists, painters and others who came from the old country were trade unionists. On the other hand, we believe in a scheme of apprentice training in this country in order to train our own unskilled artisans. During the period of depression there came a time when supply was so much more than demand that only 10 per cent of our building tradesmen and mechanics in Toronto were employed, and we had mechanics working for 10c an hour. The contract in the Leaside district for houses was practically carried out by labour working at such rates. What inducement was there in those days for men to apprentice as mechanics? We had a surplus of tradesmen at that time, and that is when we were advocating in Toronto the building of houses. Now we have a shortage.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: At the present time are there plenty of apprentices in most of the trades?

Mr. BUCKLEY: No, I would not say there are too many apprentices in the trades at the present time.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Is there a shortage of apprentices?

Mr. BUCKLEY: I would say, yes. As far as that is concerned, the apprentice question is left directly to the organizations affected. In the building trades, naturally, you cannot learn a trade unless you have practically an organized industry, otherwise you would not have a practical mechanic to show you what to do. There is an understanding in Ontario—I do not know to what extent it applies elsewhere—that only so many apprentices shall be absorbed in the trade in a given period. They are not going to take more in the trade than they can absorb. The law of supply and demand operates in regard to wages. At a time when more mechanics are in the trade than there are jobs, wages automatically fall. At the present time, as you know, there is a very large building programme, but you cannot train mechanics overnight; men cannot be put on jobs of this kind as they can be assigned to mass production. Training has to be continued over a period of time. On the railroads, where I happen to be, we have an apprenticeship system, whereby an apprentice serves five years, which means two hundred and ninety days' service every calendar year for five years.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you for some of the thoughts you have given us. You have talked to us just as bluntly as a Scotsman would.

Mr. BUCKLEY: I happen to be an Englishman.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The last of the delegation from the Trades and Labour Congress is Mr. Arthur Hemming, Associate Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. HEMMING: I do not think I have anything to add to what has already been said.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We are fortunate in having a representative from the Canadian Congress of Labour, Mr. Forsey. It is "Doctor" Forsey, is it not?

Mr. EUGENE A. FORSEY: It does not matter.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, it is Dr. Forsey. He is Director of Research for Canadian Congress of Labour. I am sure it is "Doctor" Forsey.

Mr. FORSEY: I would prefer "Mister". The truth is that I have encountered too many Ph.D.'s for whose ability I had not very much respect. I do not think a degree matters very much, it depends more on what God has put in your head in the first place, rather than what degrees you happen to have.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you not believe in experience at all?

Mr. FORSEY: Yes, experience, but—

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: He has had experience.

Mr. FORSEY: Formal education is not always all that it is cracked up to be.

Mr. Chairman and Senators, I do not know whether it is really necessary for me to read the whole of this memorandum that I have here. In large part, indeed in overwhelming part, it is a repetition of what we submitted to the Senate committee last year. I do not know how far your membership is the same as it was last year.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Or how good our memories are.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is satisfactory, we shall have this memorandum recorded, and possibly Mr. Forsey would like to make some remarks in connection with certain phases of it.

Mr. FORSEY: In formulating a suitable immigration policy it is necessary at the outset to clear our minds of two widely-held false notions. One is the "lump of work" theory: that there is only a fixed amount of work to go around, and that if you bring in more people, there will be just that much less for everybody. The other is that population in itself means prosperity: that the more people you bring in, the richer everybody will be. Clearly, extra people are not just extra stomachs; they can mean extra production. On the other hand, they do not necessarily mean extra production: an empty stomach is no



customer unless its owner can pay for what he needs to fill it. A dozen years ago we had a considerable number of empty stomachs whose owners, through no fault of their own, could produce nothing, and were able to consume only what the employed population was prepared to contribute by way of relief. India, China and other countries have very large populations but are not famous for high standards of living.

In considering Canada's capacity to absorb immigrants, the first thing to bear in mind is that the physical size of the country, the fact that it covers nearly half a continent, is almost wholly irrelevant. A large part of our territory is economically worthless and incapable of settlement. The 1945 Canada Year Book, pp. 27 and 28, classifies over 56 per cent of our land area as "waste and other land," a footnote explaining that this "includes open muskeg, rock, road allowances, urban land, etc." This land, as Professor Dymond, Director of the Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology, says, "is incapable of producing any crop other than wild life."

Agricultural land (defined as "present agricultural land of all possible classes and land that has agricultural possibilities in any sense") the Canada Year Book puts at slightly less than 16 per cent of total land area, and of this almost half is already occupied. Examination of the detailed figures shows that the official estimate must include a great deal of land whose "agricultural possibilities" are very slim indeed. It includes, for example, over 9,000,000 acres in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. It assumes, for New Brunswick, unoccupied agricultural land with an area almost one and three-quarters times as large as all existing farms in that province; for Nova Scotia and Quebec, a larger area unoccupied than occupied; for Ontario almost twice as much unoccupied as occupied. Anyone who has even a nodding acquaintance with these provinces will find it very hard to believe that much of this unoccupied land is really fit for commercial farming, and recent authoritative studies by Professor W. B. Hurd, and by Dr. A. Leahy, soil specialist of the Dominion Government (the latter summarized in the *London Economist* of January 4, 1947), confirm this impression.

The Canada Year Book shows about 168,000,000 acres of unoccupied potential agricultural land in the nine provinces; Professor Hurd (*Proceedings of Senate Committee on Immigration and Labour*, 1946, p. 291), concludes that of this only about 27,000,000 to 29,000,000 are "reasonably accessible" and "regarded as physically suitable for agricultural settlement by experts in the provinces in which they are located." "Included in these estimates," he adds, "are 10,000,000 acres in the province of Quebec, which may well prove an over-estimate by 25 per cent or more." In any event, the provincial authorities in Quebec "hold the view that all unused agricultural land in the province will be required to provide farm holdings for the increase in local farm population expected during the next few decades." This leaves about 17,000,000 to 19,000,000 acres, which, "on the basis of land utilization practices in the regions in which (they are) located, might be expected to accommodate between 70,000 and 80,000 full-time agricultural settlers. Proposed irrigation projects in the Prairie Region, if and when completed, would provide for a further net increase of something over 13,000 farm units. The total potential increase is thus set at between 83,000 and 93,000. These are outside figures. Detailed investigation has yet to demonstrate the physical and economic feasibility of much of the proposed irrigation development."

Moreover, there are probably about 12,000 farmers on sub-marginal land who "should be moved to other locations", and "are regarded by provincial authorities as having a preferred claim on unused agricultural lands". This would reduce the total to somewhere between 71,000 and 81,000 potential farms available for settlement. But out of these we should have to provide for demobil-



ized service men, farm people returning to agriculture from war industries, and such of the natural increase of rural population as may wish to become farmers themselves.

In Manitoba and Saskatchewan, "the prospective demand for farm holdings in the post-war years about offsets the prospective supply", and much the same applies to the rest of the country apart from northern Alberta, northern Ontario and central British Columbia. Their "combined settlement potential is placed at something over 50,000 new farm families" but Professor Hurd suggests that only somewhere in the neighbourhood of half, perhaps "appreciably higher—or somewhat lower" would be the potential for immigrant settlers. Moreover, "provincial experts" think it would take "between ten and twenty years" to "properly develop this potential", even "assuming that it is economically feasible to proceed without interruption and in an orderly manner".

The May 1946 number of the *Economic Annalist* (published by the Dominion Department of Agriculture) has two articles on agricultural settlement possibilities. They conclude that there is room for about 16,000 new agricultural settlers in Northern Ontario, 3,000 in Saskatchewan, 7,500 in the Peace River area of Alberta, and 2,000 to 3,000 in British Columbia, a total for these provinces of 28,500 to 29,500. *These would not necessarily, of course, all be immigrants.* The figure for Quebec they put at 75,000. They give no figures at all for Manitoba, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, but observe that "The area of potential farm land in the Maritime Provinces is relatively small. New Brunswick offers the greatest possibilities with an estimate of 1,336,000 acres, although much of this acreage cannot be expected to become very good farm land". (p. 28.) The articles emphasize that exact information on many of the areas concerned is still very scanty.

Our forest resources offer further possibilities for immigration, directly and indirectly, though here again inflated ideas are not uncommon. Total "forested land" amounts to 35 per cent of our total land area (Canada Year Book, 1945, pp. 247-8), though about a fifth of this is also included in "potential agricultural land". "Productive forested land" is about 22 per cent of total land area. (The unproductive forests "are made up of small trees which cannot be expected to reach merchantable size because they are growing on poorly drained lands, or at high altitudes, or are subject to other adverse site conditions".) Of the productive forested land, only about 56 per cent is accessible at present. Of the total stand of timber of merchantable size, about 61 per cent is accessible. This provides a physical basis for an appreciable number of settlers, including some who would combine farming and forestry.

Canada has also very large mineral resources, though one of the most important, coal, is unfortunately located at the two ends of the country, about as far as possible from the areas where it is most needed; and our supply of petroleum is nothing like large enough for our needs.

Statements like those in the six preceding paragraphs are often met with spacious generalizations about the progress of science, new discoveries and inventions which will make the desert blossom like the rose and enable us to grow bananas at the North Pole. Undoubtedly, new discoveries and new inventions may greatly increase Canada's resources, and make useful much territory now useless. But in formulating an immigration policy for the present and for the near future we must be guided by what we know now, not what we may discover some years hence. It should not be forgotten that some of the new discoveries and new inventions might make some of our existing resources useless or obsolete. The fact that the situation may change suddenly and drastically ought to make us careful to keep our policy flexible; it does not, however, provide any justification for a leap in the dark on the cheerful assumption that science will provide a comfortable landing-net at just the right moment.

So far, we have been considering simply Canada's physical resources what might be called the real size (as distinct from the size on the map) of our "great open spaces". But peopling a country is not like filling a hall or packing sardines into a tin. It is not a question of how many human beings can squash into a particular territory, nor even of how much that territory can physically be made to produce, regardless of costs and markets. It is a matter of economic, not physical, capacity; a matter not simply of what we can produce but of how much it costs us and whether we can sell it and for how much. It is also, as Mr. Fairweather of the C.N.R. pointed out to the Senate Committee in June, 1946, a matter of the standard of living: "If you want to drop the standard of living in Canada you can support an enormous population".

Canada's economic capacity to absorb agricultural immigrants is even more limited than the amount of decent land available. In the past it depended largely on northern and western Europe's capacity and willingness to absorb our wheat at remunerative prices. The demand for wheat is relatively inelastic, and the population of northern and western Europe will soon be stationary and within a few decades will begin to fall. Broadly speaking, therefore, the prospects of any considerable expansion in Canadian wheat-growing depend on two things. In the first place, it may prove possible to raise the standard of living in countries which hitherto have eaten very little wheat (notably the Orient) to a point where they will eat a lot. This, however, is obviously a long-term proposition, and depends on international action. Canada cannot industrialize the Orient single-handed. In the second place, it may prove possible to develop a very considerable use of wheat for industrial purposes. But this is perhaps an even longer-term proposition.

The demand for our other agricultural products is subject to similar limitations. Once European agriculture is re-established, we may find it hard even to keep our present export markets for meat and dairy products, unless the standard of living in other countries is raised considerably, which, again, is something we cannot do alone. Raising our own standard of living will do something to increase our market for farm produce, but not a great deal. Dr. Hopper, of the Department of Agriculture, estimates that raising the diet of every Canadian to the standard established by the Canadian Council on Nutrition would require an increase amounting to about eight per cent of our available unused agricultural land. Increasing our own population would raise the demand only if the extra people had the necessary purchasing power. As for greater industrial use of farm products, all the available authoritative evidence (as Professor Hurd points out) suggests that plastics, alcohol and other important industrial products can be made much more cheaply from raw materials of non-agricultural origin.

Nor should it be forgotten that even if there should be a considerable increase in the demand for our farm products, it does not follow that this would mean a proportionate increase in farm population, let alone in immigrant farm population. Technological progress has meant, and is bound to continue to mean, that we can produce more and more food with less and less labour per unit, and perhaps even with less and less total labour. Mr. McGowan of the C.N.R. told the Senate Committee, "It has been estimated that with modern machinery and proper organization we could produce all our food requirements with about ten per cent of our people on the land".

Markets for our non-agricultural products may also prove something of a problem. Canada has the resources to produce, and has at great expense equipped herself to produce, far more pulp and paper, base metals, gold, asbestos and ingot aluminum than she could possibly consume, even with a vastly larger population at a vastly higher standard of living. This is probably equally true of a good many of the manufactured products which we have learned to

make during the war. On the other hand, there are a good many things Canada cannot produce at all, or can produce only in inadequate amounts or at very much higher costs than other countries, or both. In 1943, when we were more highly industrialized than ever before and were straining every nerve to avoid importing more than was absolutely necessary, our total imports ran to over \$1,735,000,000, and a good third of these were of the types just noted. Clearly, it is good business for Canada to exchange her own surpluses for other countries'; and the more she is able to do this, other things being equal, the larger the population she can support and the higher the standard of living.

To a considerable degree, therefore, our future industrial development depends on the future of international trade. Even Mr. McGowan, who was by no means pessimistic, qualified his confidence that "Canada has the opportunity of entering a period of comparatively rapid growth in the years ahead," with a cautious "provided there is a reasonably effective functioning of the world economic system." But that is a large proviso. We cannot yet be anything like certain that a stable political settlement will emerge from the discussions of the Big Four Foreign Ministers and the full Peace Conference. We cannot be certain of the restoration of international trade. We cannot even be certain that the United States will avoid another major depression. The very well-informed, able and careful London *Economist* is far from hopeful on any of these points.

Even assuming that we get a stable peace, and a considerable freeing of the channels of international trade, there can be no doubt that a major depression in the United States would make it very hard both for Canada and for Britain, Canada's best customer, to maintain full employment at a decent standard of living for even the present population. It is very doubtful, indeed, whether we can expect any spectacular expansion in the outside markets for our forest or mineral products in the near future; and even under the most favourable conditions our manufactures will face strenuous competition abroad from Britain, which must export or die, and the United States, where the idea of exporting to secure full employment has gained wide acceptance.

Some people, of course, will at once suggest that, if outside markets are going to be so hard to get and keep, that is the strongest argument for bringing the outside markets inside, by bringing the customers in here and making them into Canadians. This, however, begs two questions: whether we can get them, or whether, once we have got them, we can sell the things they can produce. For, it cannot be too often repeated, there is no prospect at all that Canada will, in any future with which this Committee need concern itself, have a population large enough to consume anything like all our production of our present export staples or many of our new manufactured goods. We shall have to go on exporting on a very large scale or scrap a large part of our national economy and accept very serious underemployment of much of our capital equipment, notably our grain elevator and transportation systems, with a consequent rise in costs of production.

The development of a stable and increasing home market will depend primarily on high, stable and increasing consumption: high wages, high farm income, high productivity, a comprehensive social security system. High wages and high farm income, so far from being incompatible, are inseparable, unless, of course, they are accompanied by low productivity which makes both farm and industrial products expensive and scarce. High wages do not fall like the gentle rain from heaven; in the main, they come only, directly or indirectly from trade union action.

It may be added that unless we get high wages, decent hours and conditions of work, proper health services and a comprehensive social security system, the chances of high productivity are poor, and high productivity is one of the keys to satisfactory markets, domestic or external. The fullest possible encourage-



ment of collective bargaining, an adequate national Labour Code, and social security, are therefore essential parts of any satisfactory or workable immigration policy. They are necessary to provide a sufficient home market, to provide the conditions which will make possible the conquest of external markets, and to protect both Canadian and immigrant workers from exploitation. It might be added that until we can house our present population with some degree of decency it seems a trifle premature to talk of bringing in any large number of immigrants.

In substance our position this year is that the submission we made last year has been fully substantiated, not only by the evidence we presented then, but by subsequent evidence put in by Mr. Herbert Marshall, Dominion statistician and Dr. Stewart Bates, Deputy Minister of Fisheries. It is to evidence placed before the committee last year that I should like to draw particular attention. That evidence begins at page 5 and goes on to very nearly the end of this memorandum that we are now submitting. The figures that Mr. Marshall presented on immigration and emigration since 1851 are much more complete, accurate, and up to date than the ones which we had access to last year.

Mr. Collins, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, addressing the Senate Committee said it had been "held" (he did not say by whom) "that we could absorb easily 300,000 to 500,000 people a year," and, apparently by way of justifying this estimate, he referred to the very large numbers of immigrants who arrived in the years just before the first World War, Senator Roebuck asked if they were "absorbed here at that time." Mr. Collins replied: "They were absorbed." It would be interesting to have the evidence for this assertion. There is a good deal of evidence that a considerable number of these people were not absorbed, and that a good many who were, merely took the places of Canadians.

A table submitted to the Senate Committee last year (Proceedings p. 261) by Mr. Herbert Marshall, the Dominion Statistician, provides precise and striking evidence on this point:

I do not think I need weary you by reading the table, which you have before you. You will see that in the period from 1851 to 1941 that the number of immigrants was 6,699,226 and the number of emigrants was 6,301,320, the net movement being approximately 397,906 immigrants to Canada. For the period from 1871 to 1941, the net inward movement is 465,248.

Mr. Marshall himself commented: "It is obvious that in the past immigrants were allowed to enter in numbers far beyond the capacity of Canada to absorb them." (p. 255.) Even in the banner years of immigration, the decade before the first Great War, when we had immense areas of unoccupied farm land of the best quality, and when capital was being poured into the country on an enormous scale, and when, accordingly, as Mr. Marshall says, "our absorptive capacity was greatest, the number of immigrants was 37 per cent beyond our capacity of absorption."

A large proportion of both the native population and the new arrivals did not stay but sought what they evidently considered the greener pastures of the United States. This historical fact suggests that Mr. Collins' statements about what happened in 1911, 1912 and 1913, and his serene confidence in our ability to absorb something like 300,000 to 500,000 immigrants a year in the near future, should both be accepted with a certain reserve.

Several of Mr. Marshall's comments are worth noting in this connection. "These great surpluses of immigrants", he says, "of course caused confusion and waste effort, but more serious results were avoided because of the existence of a safety valve. The door into the United States was wide open until after 1920. Hundreds of thousands of immigrant Canadians crossed the border."

Now, I emphasize the next two sentences. *"That safety valve no longer exists. Our situation—would indeed be difficult now if immigrants were allowed*



to enter with no regard being taken of the absorptive capacity of the country." (p. 255). Any sweeping assertion that the immigrants displaced Canadian-born would be unwarranted, but "There were occasions when that happened—In the decade 1921-1931 immigrants...came in at the average rate of 120,000 per year. Many of these immigrants endeavoured to get into the United States after coming to Canada, and there is no doubt some succeeded. What happened on a larger scale was the displacing of Canadians by immigrants. Canadians, not being subject to the quota, went out and the immigrants stayed in." (pp. 252, 255.) "The general conclusions which can be drawn in this brief are that the present period, with its absence of new frontiers and the barring of the immigrant gate into the United States, is very much different from the decade of the past. A new approach to immigration policy seems imperative. The basic requirement is careful planning based on a thorough study of present capacity to absorb and sufficiently flexible to be adjusted for changing trends in the economy." (p. 256; emphasis ours.)

Further evidence of great importance was presented to the Senate Committee by Dr. Stewart Bates, then Director-General of Economic Research, Department of Reconstruction and Supply, now Deputy Minister of Fisheries. Its main points may be summed up as follows:—

(1) Canada is no longer primarily an agricultural country. The war has put us definitely and finally among the industrial nations. Hence our demand for immigrants is now "different in volume and in kind from what it was early in the century." (p. 281).

(2) Technological progress in agriculture is likely to mean that we can get a given amount of farm products with a smaller labour force than formerly, and present world shortages of foodstuffs "may begin turning surplus by 1950." Hence "it is unlikely that there will be any pressing need for new agricultural settlement in Canada", and Professor Hurd's and other authoritative estimates indicate that there will also be very little room for such settlement. (pp. 281-2.)

(3) "In our stage of economic development we do not require many more farmers or fishermen; at the moment we may need more miners and loggers, heavy labour, domestic servants, etc." (pp. 283, 286).

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I might remark that since that evidence was given last year you have had before this committee a very interesting, and it seems to me, a very careful and well informed estimate of actual requirements, maximum and minimum, at the moment for these and other types of immigrants, which has been compiled by the Statistics Branch of the Department of Labour.

(4) "In our present stage of economic development, there seems to be a case for importing training, experience and ability . . . industrialists, merchants, technicians...and craftsmen. Such a concept of selective immigration is of course different from the immigration concepts of the past, when mere numbers seemed the most important criterion..... To-day we have to attend to the quality of the population, and its ability to maximize the use of its resources, and those of other countries (by importing certain materials and re-exporting them in other forms). It is in this connection that selective immigration, forming part of an over-all program of national development may be envisaged....The import into Canada....of certain 'refugee' industries provides a ready example of the expanded diversification of our industries, and points to the gains that may be made by properly selected immigration." (pp. 284, 286.)

(5) "Our need at this particular time is not for a large volume of settlers, and immigration on the old scale is not now in question . . . An experimental target could be set up for, say, five years, and could be subject to modification according to the results, either within the experimental period or at its end. Dur-

ing this period the results of the policy could be carefully surveyed, and the history of the immigrant himself kept under surveillance to judge of the process of economic assimilation. In the beginning this target could be set in terms of past history. It could readily be larger than during the 1930's when only some 4,000 males were coming in annually; and it should perhaps be smaller than during the 1920's, when over 60,000 males came in annually. The adult immigrant target could be set . . . at perhaps 30,000 or 40,000 . . . annually, giving preference to those with training, experience and ability, in those countries whose ethnic groups appear to have the greatest power of assimilation in Canada." (pp. 288-9.)

(6) "Newcomers . . . augment and supplement the labour force, but they also raise domestic demand for the products of labour. An extension of our domestic market, combined with greater diversification of our products, would lessen to some degree our dependence on foreign markets. Some of our great export products are highly vulnerable to international conditions, and any increase in domestic population, and increased manufacture of raw into finished goods, help to reduce this vulnerability. *We are not referring to such increases in population as would make us self-sufficient: the estimated five-fold increase in home population necessary to consume our export surplus, is out of the question in the immediate future.* But even modest increases in home population can give significant added degrees of stability to industries now primarily dependent on export. A large domestic market would carry some further advantages. Some industries and services would operate on larger scale, and might thereby effect some cost-reductions. An increase in population would lessen our 'overheads' (per capita debt charges, fixed transport charges, fixed government expenditures, etc.). We might expect also that an expansion or increase in diversification of local industries and services would, by increasing the occupational opportunities at home, go part way in discouraging the emigration of high calibre native-born Canadians." (pp. 285-6.)

It should be noted, however, that, as Dr. Bates himself admits by implication, at p. 285 of his evidence, these advantages are all based on the assumption that "effective demand for the products of labour . . . is . . . sufficient to use the whole labour force." Unless the immigrants have purchasing power, unless effective demand is maintained and increased, the larger domestic market, and the reduction in "overheads" are statistical hallucinations. If we divide total debt, or total taxes, or total government expenditures, for example, by total population, we get a per capita figure. The larger the population, the lower the per capita debt, taxes or expenditure. But this is a purely arithmetical figure, without economic significance. If the immigrants go on relief, they will produce nothing and pay no taxes. They will simply be an added expense. The burden of debt per head of producing population will be higher, not lower; the taxpayer's position will be worse, not better. Immigration will not necessarily add to unemployment, but it will not necessarily add to employment either. No immigration policy can be a substitute, or even a partial substitute, for national economic planning; the best immigration policy can only be effective as part of national planning.

HON. MR. HORNER: What do you mean by national planning? What do you take from that meaning?

MR. FORSEY: If I may simply refer you to what we said in our memorandum of last year, or for that matter, what we claim at the end of this memorandum.

HON. MR. HORNER: I do not remember hearing any explanations.

MR. FORSEY: May I read that when I come to it? It might save time and if it is not clear at that time I could then possibly clear up any difficulties? If possible, I would rather finish with this evidence before going into that other discussion.

Dr. Bates pointed out that not only the demand for immigrants but also the supply "is changed in form and numbers since the early part of the century . . . The refugees and displaced persons form a ready supply available for migration to almost any area that will accord them a haven. But apart from that group, the supply of migrants has probably dwindled, particularly from western and northwestern Europe. The decline in immigration to this continent during the 1920's and 1930's was not entirely due to immigration policies and possibilities on this side; it was partly due also to the decline in the supply of migrants. . . . The ability to find immigrants of the kind we might want is . . . reduced." (p. 281.)

Dr. Bates' evidence was, of course, given before the onset of the present economic crisis in Britain. Even when he spoke, however, and still more now, he might have put this point more strongly. Plenty of Europeans may want to come here, but most European countries will be anxious to keep exactly the types of people who would make the best immigrants. Certainly Britain, facing a manpower shortage so acute that she has actually to bring in half a million immigrants herself, is not going to look kindly on proposals from this country to strip her of thousands of her most skilled and enterprising workers . . . and the present threat to her national existence is such that she may be obliged to put almost insuperable obstacles in the way of anything more than a trickle of emigration.

Honourable senators may have noticed a debate on this subject in the House of Lords not long ago, and the newspaper headlines, I think, were a trifle misleading because when I read the report underneath, it was quite evident that the Secretary of State for the Dominions, Lord Addison, although he was full of enthusiasm for playing up the overseas part of the British Commonwealth, at the same time it was evident by provisos and provisions attached in every case, that the British Government was going to be pretty sticky about letting their skilled labour out of the country.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There is a larger number of them anxious to immigrate to Canada than there ever was.

Mr. FORSEY: That is so, but whether they ever get out will be another question.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I do not think that Canada has ever had a better time than the present to make it possible for immigrants to come into our country, and if we continue to have all this formality in regard to immigration we shall not profit by our past experience.

The past years in Canada have demonstrated to me, and should have demonstrated to any person in Canada, the success of free enterprise and of opportunity for an individual, without going through too much regulations of becoming a Canadian citizen. That was the record of our forefathers, and it has been the record of the Maritime provinces and of Ontario and of the United States as well, in making it possible for people to come into the country and establish themselves. I am of the opinion that there is too much regulation now.

Mr. FORSEY: In relation to this particular question of immigration I would simply direct your attention, honourable senators, to the figures Mr. Marshall submitted last year and which are summarized at the bottom of page 5 of this memorandum. It is quite evident, I should say, that the free enterprise of immigration brought us a lot of people; but it took out as many as it brought in.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I do not know that I accept that argument that Canada was not capable of accepting more people.

Mr. FORSEY: I do not ask you to accept the argument, Mr. Senator, I simply say that the people did not stay.



Hon. Mr. HORNER: There was greater opportunity in the United States.

Mr. FORSEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There was a larger population. Because we happen to be situated geographically beside a country that was prosperous at that time does not answer the argument—and I do not accept it as an argument—that Canada was not capable of absorbing every immigrant that came here.

Mr. FORSEY: You are entitled to your interpretation.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I want it on the record that I do not accept that argument.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Is it so that the British Government is likely to prohibit emigrants coming to Canada?

Mr. FORSEY: I do not think there will be any prohibition unless conditions become worse; although the London Economist says that Britain faces a worst winter this year than last. However I say there are more ways than one of killing a cat. Ennumerable difficulties can be put in the way of people who want to leave, and enumerable inducements can be put up to people they want to keep. I should be very much surprised if that policy is followed; that is merely a surmise on my part.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I should think that would be the case for a few years. The impression I have is that while the British Government, or the public authorities, would like to keep their people at home, particularly at the present time, that they would not put any bar in their way if they desired to migrate; they might prohibit the export of capital or something of that nature, which would affect the movement of the people. But I think the conditions Dr. Forsey mentioned will more or less run on for a few years in Britain.

Mr. FORSEY: We must consider the perspective in which we are looking at this problem. I do not know what exactly your committee has in mind. Are you thinking of it as a long-range problem, or an immediate opportunity—as I gather from the remarks of one of the senators—of getting an immense number of people within the next year or two, or are you thinking of it from both perspectives?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Distinctly from both perspectives.

Mr. FORSEY: I am trying to suggest that the supply of immigrants both as a long and short-range proposition is considerably less, apart from the refugees and displaced persons, than it was forty years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: You have in mind Great Britain?

Mr. FORSEY: I am thinking of other countries too.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There are other countries.

Mr. FORSEY: France is obviously a case where they will put every possible obstacle in the way of emigration, because they are having to import labour on a large scale. It may however be that the country may get so hard up that it will be thankful to get rid of some people.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Italy is anxious to emigrate some of its population because obviously it can scarcely support them.

Mr. FORSEY: A good deal depends on how far the Truman doctrine is applied in Italy; and also on who gets political power in Italy.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Do you think the Truman doctrine would have any effect on that situation?

Mr. FORSEY: I think it would have. If they can get the large amounts in the way of financial help from the United States it may not have an effect.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Even if Italy gets hundreds of millions of dollars a year from the United States it would not give them the resources in their country necessary to support an increasing population.



Mr. FORSEY: Not an increasing population, no.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: They are shut off at the moment; at any rate they have lost their colonies for the time being, and that outlet for emigration has ceased at least for the present.

Mr. FORSEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I would say, Dr. Forsey, that today there are millions of people in Europe who would think they were almost entering paradise if permitted to come to North America.

Mr. FORSEY: I think that is probably quite true, Senator, but their wishes in the matter and their feelings about it might be very different from what will actually happen. For instance the greater part of northern and Western Europe is short of manpower now, especially skilled manpower.

The CHAIRMAN: As a result of the war?

Mr. FORSEY: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Only Denmark is in a position to let some of the population emigrate.

Mr. FORSEY: If we consider Eastern Europe I think it very unlikely—I do not want to be accused of spreading political propaganda—that the countries in Eastern Europe will let a large number of people emigrate.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That may be true.

Mr. FORSEY: Of course you have the south left.

The CHAIRMAN: When you refer to Eastern Europe, will you specify the nationalities and racial extractions that you have in mind.

Mr. FORSEY: When I refer to Eastern Europe I would include the Soviet Union, from which I am perfectly satisfied no people will come even if they want to; I would include Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and the eastern portion of Germany, the Russian occupied zone. This is merely my opinion, and I may be wrong; and the Canadian Tribune may try to criticize me tomorrow morning for saying this, but it is my opinion that those countries will not let their people out; they may have the most admirable reasons for doing so. I am not offering any criticism of them but I am simply saying that I do not think we will get many people from those countries because they will not let them out.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: We have had representatives from some of these countries before the committee.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: They may not let them come on pain of death.

Mr. FORSEY: They may not allow them to come and they may have excellent reasons for not doing so.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: You said, Mr. Forsey, that no farm workers were required in this country?

Mr. FORSEY: I will return to that subject in a moment.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There is a point I want to stress in that regard. The difficulty with labour and labour organizations today is the shortness of the hours. The witness who appeared previous to yourself said that all wealth was labour. But labour is idle part of the time, and half the workers are restricting certain production, with the idea of spinning out labour. May I tell you that a man receiving \$100 to \$125 a month on the farm today refuses to do certain types of work; but when a hired man was getting \$25 a month he would milk cows or do anything at all. Today they refuse to get up in the morning and refuse to do certain types of work they would do when they were getting half the wages. That is the unfair attitude of labour, and there are thousands of farmers in this country who would have men but they simply

refuse to do the work they are asked to do. With more regulations and more planning you will have to use a bayonet to get certain work done at all. In the countries where they have thorough planning a man is ordered to do certain work and he has no choice. We are all mixed up in this country—half slave and half free—and we are all tied up.

Mr. FORSEY: Of course farm labour in this country is not organized. Perhaps if it were it would be more responsible and effective.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Don't think it is not organized.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Dr. Forsey, many of those who come to Canada have one thought in mind: making Canada merely stepping stone to the United States. They look upon the United States as the Garden of Eden. I think that gives a rather wrong impression of conditions today. We are considered almost on a par with the United States, I think, as a desirable country. I know particularly of those who were brought out for the purpose of doing housework, they came here simply with the idea of going to the United States.

Mr. FORSEY: I think that is quite correct.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It has been indicated now that the building program has been stopped on account of excessive costs.

Mr. FORSEY: May I summarize the remainder of my brief?

Much the same is true of most of the countries of northern and western Europe, and it may safely be assumed that it is even truer of central and eastern and southern Europe, apart from the refugees and displaced persons, not all of whom would by any means be suitable immigrants from an economic point of view. It would, in short, be most unwise to base our immigration policy on the assumption that we can get as many suitable immigrants as we may want, or that we have only to reach out and take our pick of the world's population. Even if we are prepared to pay substantial amounts for assisted passages, we may find it very hard indeed to get any appreciable number of the kind of people we want.

Both Mr. Marshall and Dr. Bates drew attention to another factor which must be considered in framing a rational immigration policy; the age composition of the population.

The last two Censuses have shown a steadily rising proportion of old people in our population, and the recent Dominion Bureau of Statistics Bulletin F-4, *The Future Population of Canada*, shows that this trend is likely to continue and to become more marked. The following table shows the percentages of persons of 70 years and over, 65 and over and 60 and over in 1921, 1931 and 1941, and the estimated percentages for 1951, 1961, and 1971:—

	1921	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
70 and over.....	2.8	3.3	4.0	4.7- 4.8	5.8- 6.0	6.7- 7.0
65 and over.....	4.8	5.5	6.7	7.9- 8.0	8.2- 9.5	10.4-11.0
60 and over.....	7.5	8.4	10.2	11.8-12.0	13.2-13.6	15.2-15.9

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: If your conclusions there are accurate and that trend continues, in a hundred years our population would have a tremendous number of old people.

Mr. FORSEY: Yes, I think we will have a tremendous number.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I do not subscribe to that theory.

Mr. FORSEY: That is as to the tendency of the population getting older?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Gentlemen, I know I make myself unpopular watching the clock, but if this witness takes more than ten minutes, someone else will have to take less time.

Mr. Forsey, could you conclude your remarks within the next ten or fifteen minutes, if we leave you alone?

Mr. FORSEY: I think so.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a question asked by Senator Horner.

Mr. FORSEY: The Senator raised a question about farm labour. I think the question of the demand for farm labour has been covered, and I have nothing more to add. The whole question of agricultural immigration has been dealt with in the first part of this memorandum, and dealt with last year in Mr. Marshall's and Dr. Bates' presentation to the committee, and in the results of the investigation by Professor Hurd.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Forsey, would you read the last two paragraphs of your submission? I think they should be stressed.

Mr. FORSEY: I might venture to read the remainder of my brief as a reply to Senator Horner's question.

On the other hand, while the proportion of persons of working age has increased and is likely to go on increasing at least till 1971, its rate of increase has been and is likely to be much lower than that of the aged population. Raising the school leaving age and lowering the age for old-age pensions will accentuate this tendency. Other things being equal, immigration policy ought therefore to give preference to people who are, or soon will be, of working age. There is no reason why Canada should be expected to serve as a sort of international old people's home.

Mr. Marshall noted that "the age composition of the population is adversely affected by heavy immigration", adding that an immigration policy "which would encourage the entry of young families rather than single persons would alleviate the problems connected with an ageing population" (p. 256); and Dr. Bates (pp. 286-287) urged the same point.

The question of immigration is just part of our general national economic problem. It cannot be viewed in isolation. Specifically, it must be related to the Government's declared aim of maintaining a high level of employment and income. We want as many immigrants as will give us the highest possible standard of living for the masses of the people. We do not want immigration used as a means of getting cheap and docile workers and breaking down the standards which organized labour has built up. We do not want it used to provide employers with a pool or reserve of unemployed workers who will be taken on when the employer can make more profit by using extra hands, laid off and maintained at the taxpayers' expense when he cannot, and used as a big stick to keep labour in its place.

The first aim of national economic policy should be to provide full employment at decent incomes for our own people. This will require national economic planning at least to the degree contemplated by Lord Beveridge in his *Full Employment in a Free Society*.

I hope honourable members of the committee are familiar with the work, even if they do not agree with it; they will find it very stimulating. It is a formidable work, but Lord Beveridge has summarized it in the first forty or fifty pages.

Of such planning, immigration policy would be a necessary, and might be a most important, part. The Minister of Finance, or other responsible Minister, in drawing up his manpower budget, would have to plan for private and public expenditure for consumption and investment on a scale sufficient to employ the whole working force of the nation, and to provide the goods and services which a modern civilized community has a right to expect. He might well find that the country needed a larger working force than was available from the existing population. He might find that there was not enough skilled labour of certain types, and that the time needed to train the necessary number of workers was so long that the delay would seriously hamper national development. In these circumstances, he would presumably recommend bringing in the proper number and kinds of immigrant workers, and the government would



bring them in, take them where they were needed, and see that they were decently established in the community.

I do not really care very much whether you use the term "planning" or whether you do not. But it seems you have got to have some general economic policy, whatever kind of policy it is.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: That does not explain it at all.

Mr. FORSEY: Just a minute, if I may proceed.

In other words, immigration policy would have to be dovetailed in with general employment policy, housing policy, a labour code, and social security. Immigration would have to be planned, as indeed Dr. Bates indicated, not left to the hit or miss, catch as catch can, Micawberish methods of the years before 1914. We cannot afford to let people come here just as they please, or as suits the convenience and profit of private interests. We cannot afford to leave the immigrant to sink or swim. We cannot afford to expose Canadian workers to the constant threat of having their standards undercut by immigrants who must take any kind of job at any wages and under any conditions to avoid sheer starvation.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that this memorandum has attempted to deal with immigration proper, on which we made our position clear last year, not with the humanitarian question of the admission of refugees; and that it has concentrated on the purely economic aspects of the question. It has not attempted to touch on such matters as racial discrimination, which we dealt with also last year, or the relative degrees of assimilability of immigrants from various countries or of different ethnic stocks, important as these are.

I want to emphasize one thing there—and I shall come back in a second or two to what Senator Horner was saying—that we protest most strongly against the attempt which was made in another place to represent us as calling for an open door for Asiatic immigration. That is a complete travesty of the attitude which we presented to this committee last year, as I think those of you who were members of that committee will recognize, and I hope that anything we have said either last year or this will be made to appear in that light. Senator Horner says that the passage I read there does not answer the question about planning. The answer is, as Senator Roebuck has indicated, the time is very short, and I cannot monopolize the whole of it; it is completely impossible to give an answer to Senator Horner's question within the limits of time available.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Is the only answer that it would have to be done by dictatorship?

Mr. FORSEY: No, that is not the only answer, sir. If you will read Lord Beveridge's book—

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I have read it. I cannot see anything else in it but government dictatorship.

Mr. FORSEY: Then nothing I can say would have any effect. It would be mere waste of breath for me to discuss it further.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I could give the name of a man in Ontario who had eighteen or twenty different types of machinery and kept a number of men to attend to it. He was doing very well, when he found that his men would not do the work. He called them all together and he raised their wages, then they did so much less work that he finally had to have a sale; he sold everything off the farm, and seeded it down and is running cattle on it.

Mr. FORSEY: Do you suggest that is a general condition, Senator?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I am afraid it is. He thought he would fix things by raising wages, but they did so much less.



Mr. FORSEY: That is curious, seeing that agricultural production is as high as it is. I am surprised that we have anything but deserted farms in this country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are not suggesting that wages should be reduced?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: No, but I suggest that there should be opportunities for free enterprise. A man should not be a labourer all his life.

The CHAIRMAN: Senator Crerar would like to ask some questions.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: You presented a very interesting statement here, and I have drawn certain conclusions from it. I should like very much to have a chance of discussing this with you for some little time. In the second last paragraph on page 9 of your memorandum appears this statement: "Immigration would have to be planned, not left to the hit-or-miss, catch-as-catch-can, Micawberish methods of the years before 1914". Would you admit, Doctor, that under these "Micawberish methods", say from Confederation down to 1914, Canada made substantial progress?

Mr. FORSEY: Well, that is like the question, have you stopped beating your wife? It assumes, I think, Senator—

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Oh, no, no.

Mr. FORSEY: Wait a minute: Just a second.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I do not think so.

Mr. FORSEY: I think it assumes *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, to use an old Latin tag; that is, if one thing happens after another, the second thing is the result of the first—which does not, of course, necessarily follow. There is not any doubt that during that period Canada made enormous progress, and there may be a great variety of opinions as to what it was due to. It was due in part, I should say, to a large investment of outside capital in this country. Having been for part of my life a good Conservative, I should like to put in a word for the National Policy and the genius of Sir John A. MacDonald. If I were an ex-Liberal instead of an ex-Conservative, I should put in a word, no doubt, for Sir Wilfred Laurier and his various policies.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I think you are begging the question a little bit. My point is this, that from Confederation until 1915, and particularly in the last fifteen years of that period, Canada made very great progress.

Mr. FORSEY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Unquestionably the standards of living were rising considerably all over. And my point is that this policy, which you described as "hit-or-miss, catch-as-catch-can, Micawberish methods" was the policy which produced those results.

Mr. FORSEY: Perhaps, but it seems to me you are the one who is begging the question, because you seem to be attributing this progress to a single cause, immigration policy. Or perhaps I misunderstood you.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: No, that is correct. That is in the main correct. My contention is that if we had not adopted a vigorous immigration policy fifty years ago, this country would still be lumbering along with a population of probably seven or eight million people.

Mr. FORSEY: I think part of the answer is those figures of Mr. Marshall's.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I do not agree with Dr. Marshall's conclusions at all.

Mr. FORSEY: I am not talking about his conclusions, I am talking about the sheer effect of the figures here.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: The fact of the matter is that we were losing population very rapidly. But there were other reasons for that.

Mr. FORSEY: Yes. There were numerous reasons.

HON. MR. CRERAR: We have not time to go into that. For instance, very heavy migration from the maritime provinces to New England or other places of wider opportunity.

MR. FORSEY: And from Quebec.

HON. MR. CRERAR: And from Quebec; also from western Ontario, for Minnesota and the Dakotas were settled largely by settlers who came in from the province of Ontario. Those conditions would have continued if we had not, through, I submit, a vigorous immigration opened up the resources of this country and given opportunities for people and at the same time raised our standard of living, and I disagree completely with the suggestion that that was a "hit-or-miss, catch-as-catch-can, Micawberish" policy.

HON. MR. HORNER: Might I interject here that the success of these immigrants produced millions of dollars for this country. As Senator Crerar has said, they went on land which Canadians drove by and refused to settle on; it looked good to these people, and part of our success was achieved by them.

MR. FORSEY: And how much of that land is there now?

HON. MR. HORNER: Lots of it.

MR. FORSEY: You think so, but the people who made the most careful studies of this subject think not.

HON. MR. HORNER: They are theorists.

MR. FORSEY: I am not saying that there ought not to have been a vigorous immigration policy, but I do say that a vigorous immigration policy is not any assistance without a greater degree of prudence, foresight and planning than was in fact shown in the immigration policy in the early years of this century. I am not saying that we should just sit idle with folded hands, but I think there is a difference between just threshing about and flailing the air, and laying down a careful, considered policy where you know what you are going to do and how you are going to do it, instead of, as old Stephen Leacock said, "mounting your horse and riding off rapidly in all directions". I decline to be put in the position of advocating a do nothing policy.

HON. MR. CRERAR: No, no.

MR. FORSEY: Now or in the past.

HON. MR. CRERAR: Please do not misunderstand me, Doctor. But I will say this: my view is that if from 1867 on we had applied to our development policies in Canada the principles that you are laying down here, Canada would not have made anything like the progress it has made.

MR. FORSEY: We might not have had two rebellions in the northwest if we had applied some of these principles. And we might not have lost so many of these people to the United States.

HON. MR. CRERAR: The rebellions in the northwest would hardly be attributed to that.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: It is analogous to what he says, because the rebellions were the result of stupidity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are very much obliged to you, sir. Though some of us, perhaps, do not agree, we are glad to have heard your arguments.

HON. MR. CRERAR: I want to second that. I differ pretty strongly from this, but this is a very stimulating statement.

HON. MR. ROEBUCK: You bet it is.

There is just one more of the labour group, Mr. Pat Conroy, to address us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members of this committee, please read, in relation to the discussion we have had a few minutes ago, the figures on page 5 of this report which has been before us, because I think it answers some of the questions that have been raised.

Mr. PAT CONROY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an oral statement. Mr. Chairman, and honourable members of the committee, I have come here not essentially as a member of a labour organization, but rather, I hope, as a fair to middling good Canadian, in the hope that we can make a contribution to the solution of this question.

I think it is fair to say that the sentiment of the people of Canada, regardless of their social, political or economic beliefs, is that Canada must have more people. That conclusion, I think, stems largely from two bases of the thinking of the Canadian people. First of all, we have this extremely large country with virtually only a handful of people inside of it; and because of the uncertain world situation many of us are quite worried lest if we do not look after our heritage we may lose it. The conclusion of that thinking is that, consequently, we should have more people come to Canada.

In principle I think that most Canadians are agreed with that thinking. There may be differences of approach to the question, but we are pretty well unanimous in the opinion that we must have more than 12 million people across this great space we call the Dominion of Canada. Thinking in terms of immigration, I feel it is essential also that we eliminate the deadwood from our thinking. When we talk about more people coming to Canada, what actually are we thinking about? Are we thinking of boat load after boat load of anonymous individuals coming from undefined nations to land in Canada to be shifted to the four winds so as not to have us hear anything more about them; or, are we thinking in terms of hundreds of thousands and maybe ultimately millions of thousands coming to this country and making it a greater nation than it now is?

We think Canada is a great nation but we feel that it can still reach a greater degree of maturity and development than it is presently in. Our history has been a great one in the main. Canadians by and large are not inclined to beat their chests and boast about their accomplishments, but I should say that, taking the span of our history, Canada and its people have not much to apologize for to any other nation.

I would also say that, regardless of the disrepute into which some words such as the word "planning" have fallen before some members of this committee, if we want immigration to do a job for us and help our nation, we must consider all avenues of approach to solve it rather than to allow our prejudice to dominate the consideration of what is probably one of the most vital problems concerning this nation.

I am not concerned with planning merely for the sake of planning; neither am I concerned with what may be termed as a "hit and miss" method because that may be good or bad. I am concerned with what I suggest every Canadian must be concerned with, and that is the result of the policy itself. I say this because, no matter what the method may be, the result will finally tell its own story. Despite our history and the fact that we can be proud of it without being too much of a braggart in that respect, and whether the question calls for more planning or whether it calls for less planning, it is an established fact, at least in my mind, that our past policies in so far as immigration in Canada are concerned, must be improved upon. As I see the immigration question I conceive it to be somewhat like this: it is not merely in the sense of bringing more people into Canada because more people in themselves do not mean a thing. If a larger population in itself meant anything to anyone, then we might immediately select as immigrants people from India and China, two countries in which there are to be found lower living standards than perhaps any country in the world. In this respect I doubt whether a single Canadian, no matter what his viewpoint, would say that immigrants from China or India would be a good thing.



When we talk about bringing in immigrants we are also talking about keeping them here, and when we talk about keeping them here we want them to have good sense and the wherewithal of life to be proud of the nation to which they have come.

Despite the fact that figures may be contradicted by theorists and theoretical conclusions and all the rest of it, at least they cannot be ignored. We have assumed that the government is the most impartial agency in the country for selecting the figures to give to the people of Canada, and some appreciation must be extended for the figures on hand. The figures on immigration in Canada from 1851 to 1941 do not tell a good story. They disclose, in fact, that just over six millions of people have come into this country while close to six millions have left the country. The net gain over a ninety-year period has been 7.4 per cent. In short, over a period of the entire history of the nation since it became a dominion, in fact, sixteen years before it became a nation, for every one hundred people that came into Canada ninety-three left. No matter what your committee may recommend, it appears to me that this is a calendar of events that cannot be disregarded in formulating the immigration policy of the future.

I am sorry that labour has been used as somewhat of a whipping boy in the policy of immigration, and I should say that labour is not to be used for that purpose. It is not to be a whipping boy for anybody. We point out, as in my initial statement, that Canada has made marvellous progress. The country has had a great history. We also appreciate that there has been substantial rises and improvements in the living standards of Canadians. Rightly or wrongly we think that if it had not been for labour unions in Canada, the living conditions in this country would not be as good as they now are.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Right.

Hon. Mr. CONROY: These living standards have been raised for the very obvious and decided reason of benefiting those people who previously had very bad living conditions. If they themselves had not taken the initiative through their organizations, the living standards of the rank and file of people in Canada would not be as they are today. It is a well established fact that, while there may have been a small percentage of employers voluntarily improving living standards, by and large, it has been the power of labour that has had to force employers to improve these living standards.

As to the future policy of immigration we believe that there is nothing subtle or political about it, and there is nothing wholly economic about it. First of all, whether or not we are given credit for it, we like to believe we are good Canadians, and therefore our first concern should be for the welfare of our country as a whole. Consequently, for the moment, we feel that we should have more people. Perhaps the problem is how to get these people here, but more important, how to keep them here. As taxpayers of Canada are we going to approve of tens of thousands of people coming to this country when we have to bear the expense of training them and of having them assimilated into good Canadian citizenship when it may only result in losing nine out of every ten of them? To me that seems to be the worst possible form of investment that this nation could make. In short, according to these figures, Canada has not been accepting immigrants and taking care of them. We have been merely acting as a funnel, as a sieve, and for every ten people that have come in the front door nine have gone out the back door to places where there seems to be greater opportunities. I would say that, despite the disrepute that the word "planning" seems to have fallen into before some of the members of this committee, the complete planless system of your last ninety years of immigration policy—to me at any rate—is sufficient incentive to have a complete reorientation of the whole policy of immigration. If we are to continue for the next five, ten or twenty-five years the policy of immigration of the last ninety years, thereby continuing to



lose nine out of every ten people that come into Canada, then I submit in all seriousness, sirs, that it is not a good investment for this nation. I say this because I think it can be reasonably accepted that it is not just the new immigrant who leaves Canada in one or two years, it is a composite force. Among those who leave the country early are youngsters whom we have trained and schooled in Canada at a cost to the people of this country in unheard of sums that I do not suppose can be calculated. The trained brains of the nation have been literally compelled to leave, and unless we can stop that leakage we have got to adjust ourselves to accepting the fact that we are not capable of devising a proper immigration policy. What the powers of absorption by Canada are I do not pretend to know.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They are very great.

Hon. Mr. CONROY: I know that there is a lot of play on words as to what Canada can absorb. Some talk in terms of square miles and make it appear automatic that there should be so many people to the square mile. Without crediting too much to the theorists, who also seem to be in disrepute, I do not think that anyone who looks around this country can argue that there is not a good bit of land in Canada which cannot be settled no matter how many immigrants you bring in. Because of this I think we should try to eliminate the abuse that seems to be prevalent in our minds that there is in Canada an almost unlimited capacity to accept an almost perpetual inflow of people.

I feel that what we should first try to do is to find out how many people we can absorb over a given period of years. Consistent with order and good government—because there must be good order in immigration just as there is in any other institution—we must try to find out how many people Canada can absorb from year to year and place safely throughout the country. I realize that even in the best institution there is going to be a gamble. In fact, I am not sufficient of a planner that I do not appreciate a gamble once in a while myself by way of an occasional ticket in the Irish Sweepstakes. What I am endeavouring to say is that there is no foolproof system in planning. Accepting that fact and putting it to one side, there is nothing that should prevent us from using the good sense and intelligence that God gave us to profit from experience and eliminate the errors of the past. If in the next quarter of a century we bring into Canada several million people it will be as much as human minds and human hands can accomplish, and we should do this with the end in view of preventing the nine people out of ten who came here from going to the United States or some other country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Conroy, I think we can accept, for argument's sake at least, your thesis with regard to the necessity of forethought and making the necessary arrangements, which you call planning. I wish we had time and you were prepared to elaborate on what you mean by planning, and what we should do.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, on that point the argument would be much stronger if the immigrants had been lost to a country that had any degree of planning. Those immigrants we lost during the ninety years did not go to a country where there was any more planning than in our own country. In other countries today where they have planning there is a strict rule forbidding any person leaving the country. If we had a plan whereby we kept our immigrants and prohibited them from leaving it would be a different matter.

Mr. CONROY: My point, sir, is this that it does not matter what plan is in effect in any other nation; I am not concerned with that. That is the policy of that nation and we have no right to interfere with it, other than take the benefit of a better policy. I do say that up until now our policy has absolutely failed insofar as the proper end of immigration is concerned.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I do not agree. Every man has a choice, and some chose to leave.

Mr. CONROY: We have lost six million people and slightly over six million came in. If that is an asset, I want to be shown.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It has been an asset.

Mr. CONROY: To lose six million people?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Many of them performed work in this country before they left.

Mr. CONROY: Their chief function was to leave the nation, and that was a loss to our country.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: But they did not go to a country where there was any more planning than there is here.

Mr. CONROY: They went because there was better opportunity.

That is all I have to say at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Conroy.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I hope to hear you some day on what we should do in the way of planning.

Mr. CONROY: I shall be willing to come before the committee at any time.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am sure that Mr. Marshall must have been gratified as he sat here today and listened to the discussion and to observe how useful has been his statement of last year, and how much it has been read, mulled over and considered. Dr. Marshall, the Dominion Statistician, is with us again.

Mr. HERBERT MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, I really have not much to add to what I said last year. Some of what I said evidently did not meet with complete approval of all of the senators, and I fear I am a stubborn Dominion Statistician, and I still have to stick to what I said previously.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Your figures have not changed?

Mr. MARSHALL: They have not changed.

I have prepared a short brief in which I propose to elaborate somewhat on one of the points brought up last year. The title of this brief is "The Question of Absorptive Capacity in Relation to Immigration Policy." It reads as follows:—

There have been many forecasts of the future population of Canada, ranging from 15,000,000 to 250,000,000. What our population will be eventually depends upon a great many factors, many of which await future developments. It is certain that some optimistic estimates have been based on uncritical appraisals of existing situations. For the formulation of an immigration policy it is necessary to have a more solid basis than forecasts which are little more than wishful thinking.

Setting a numerical objective for immigration is a very difficult task because it is impossible to predict what the absorptive capacity of Canada will be in the future. A brief consideration of the principal criteria which have been used as a basis for the claim that Canada is underpopulated or, in other words, has capacity to absorb immigrants, will indicate some of the difficulties.

#### OPTIMUM POPULATION

The term "optimum population" is sometimes used in reference to a country's absorptive capacity for additional people. The optimum population for Canada would be one which would enable Canadians to get the best results from their

activities and thus obtain the highest standard of living possible with existing resources. The idea has been expressed by Professor Carr-Saunders in these words:—

In any country under any given set of conditions there may be too sparse a population in the sense that, if the population was more dense, on the average every one would be better off; this is so because there are benefits arising from co-operation and division of labour, and there may be so few people that these benefits cannot be reaped. On the other hand there may be too many people in the sense that, if there were fewer, everyone would be better off.

Unfortunately there is no way by which the optimum population can be calculated. Gunnar Myrdal, the well-known Swedish authority on population problems, concludes a discussion on the concept of optimum population in these words:—

It has, of course, never been possible anywhere to give for any country a quantitatively expressed answer to the practical question of the actual position of this population optimum. The theory is a speculative figment of the mind without much connection with this world; it does not give any guiding rule for the practical and political judgment of reality. Actually the theory has mostly been utilized to furnish a broad and vague foundation for the opinion that the level of living should be higher with a smaller population.

#### CARRYING CAPACITY

Another supposed indication of absorptive capacity for population has been called "carrying capacity". According to this view a country would be under-populated as long as it could produce more food than its inhabitants can consume. This is not a suitable yardstick for a country whose people are used to a standard of living which is considerably above subsistence. Nor is per capita food production a good indication of carrying capacity for population in a country which depends largely on export trade. The climate of Canada creates needs for clothing, housing, fuel and other items, many of which have to be met by imports, which have to be paid for by exports, including large exports of foodstuffs.

#### DENSITY

Low density per square mile is often taken as an indication of under-population. In its crudest form the argument compares the superficial area in square miles of various countries, the population in each and the resulting densities by simple division of area into population. Others attempt to arrive at a more reasonable figure by comparing estimated habitable areas, or regions of stated annual rainfall in each country, and their related densities. Density of population, however, is dependent upon a great many factors, and comparison of superficial areas can lead to most erroneous conclusions. Industrial development, soil fertility, foreign markets, standard of living, topography, climate, and many other factors must be considered in order to judge whether or not a country is underpopulated. During the last four decades there has been a radical shifting of the population from rural to urban districts, which is the opposite of what one would expect if population movements were based on relative density per square mile.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

Underpopulation is often predicated in relation to natural resources. There is, however, much loose thinking in the delineation of natural resources. The tar sands of Alberta or coal deposits in certain areas or of certain grades may be



resources some time in the future, but they are not economic assets until they can be utilized. Much timber in Canada is at present not an economic asset because of its inaccessibility. The exploitation of certain known resources must await the development of an effective demand for them. The existence of the fertile plains of the Prairie Provinces was known for generations before they could be exploited. They had to await the creation of a market through adequate transportation, higher prosperity in Europe, the filling up of the more accessible lands in the Western States and the development of agricultural technique suitable for prairie soil and climatical conditions. Hence natural resources, even if known accurately, have to be related to the possibilities of utilization. Predictions on this basis are impossible because in many instances it cannot be known when they will be utilized, or even if they will ever be utilized.

It has been argued that increased population creates demands which lead to the exploitation of natural resources, but the experience of the past indicates clearly that flows of immigration came after increased industrial activity, the development of resources, or the application of new techniques. The opening of the Canadian West was in response to the factors mentioned above, not the least of which was a world-wide demand for foodstuffs and other raw products in the middle nineties of the last century. The movement of population into Canada, which reached its peak in the decade 1901-11, was by no means due only to the development of the West, but rather to the development of the whole country which accompanied the growth in the West. A large proportion of the immigrants remained in the East and in urban centres.

It has been argued by some that it is incorrect to say that in the past the numbers of immigrants who came into Canada were so great that Canada could not absorb them; that many of them went to the United States because conditions were more to their liking there than in Canada. The thought behind this argument really is that immigration precedes and is the cause of prosperity periods. The fact is that the reverse is true.

### ECONOMIC ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

The foregoing leads to the conclusion that the real criterion on which an immigration policy should be based is one relating to the economic needs of the country. It is of vital importance that this fact should be fully recognized at the present time. There is no doubt that since 1851 Canada brought in several millions of immigrants more than she could absorb. This was a costly and confusing procedure but more serious maladjustments were prevented by the fact that there was an open door into the United States which acted as a safety valve to draw off the surplus. This door is now closed. Because of this fact a long-term Canadian immigration policy now should be as closely related as possible to actual economic needs. If, as in the past, scores of thousands of immigrants came in beyond our capacity to absorb the result would be disastrous because they could not be drained off anywhere else. Perhaps the result would be a heavy outflow of Canadian-born.

In summary it may be said:—

1. Certain criteria which are often used as a basis for statements concerning the absorptive capacity for new population are quite unreliable. These include the concept of optimum population, carrying capacity, density, and natural resources.

2. The objectively ascertained economic needs of Canada is the only reliable criterion of absorptive capacity.

3. The logical and historical sequence of events is that immigration follows expansion and prosperity, it does not precede and create these conditions.



4. Finally, a long-term immigration policy should be flexible so that it can be modified quickly as to numbers of immigrants admitted to conform to changes in economic conditions.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You will remember, Dr. Marshall, that last year I took objection to the statement to the effect of Canada's inability to absorb the immigrants who left. I think I argued at that time that the fact only justified the phrase "Canada's inability to retain" which is quite different from "Canada's inability to absorb". I thought the speaker had drawn a unsupportable conclusion that because we could not retain the immigrants we could not absorb them. The fact was that somebody else offered them better opportunities than we did, and for some reason they left us. But, is it a fair statement or a necessary conclusion that because we did not retain them we could not absorb them?

Mr. MARSHALL: It seems to me that we have certain conditions, and those conditions vary from decade to decade, nevertheless in relation to the conditions existing it is obvious that a great many of immigrants who came into Canada were not satisfied with existing conditions and they went to the United States or other places. That seems to me to be a pretty good indication in itself of the fact that we were not able to absorb them. We must come to the conclusion that if they do not stay here we cannot absorb them.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Let us put it this way: If it was impossible for one immigrant to be brought here, and for one native Canadian to leave the country, I suggest that we would be more prosperous and everything would be all right in this country.

Mr. MARSHALL: I think we must look at this problem from a more general point of view. From the general point of view it seems to me that it can be argued that if immigrants stream into the country in large numbers they look for economic opportunities here; if they do not find them they go out again. The argument is, therefore, that we could not absorb them; there is a second line of argument, substantiated by those who have studied the history of immigration. For example, I know that there was an investigation by some economists into the history of immigration into the United States; they correlated the flow of immigrants and emigrants with the movements in the business cycle and came to the conclusion that when you had an upward movement of the business cycle, that is to say that when conditions were favourable, it was not long before the flow of immigrants increased, and that when business began to become adverse, there was a counter movement; a good many of these immigrants left the United States. I think that is pretty well substantiated. If you study the history of immigration and relate it to the ups and downs of the business cycle, it will be found that immigration does come after there has been a period of prosperity. I think in the case of Canada that is very well substantiated in the history of immigration into the western provinces. The western provinces could not be filled up until certain conditions were ripe for it. There had to be a demand for foodstuffs, for one thing; there had to be transportation facilities to take those foodstuffs across the ocean. At the same time, around 1896, populations were rapidly increasing, and there was a big increase in the amount of gold in the world. All these facts made for a world condition of prosperity. Another circumstance was that the American west had filled up. Conditions were just ripe for these immigrants to come in. They had economic opportunities, because there was free land there; and there was a market for the products which they were going to produce. So that the argument seems to be born out by Canadian history too, that immigration follows the upward movement in the business cycle.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: You say, Doctor Marshall, that the logical and historical sequence of events is that immigration follows expansion and prosperity, it does not precede and create these conditions?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Now, when you speak of expansion and prosperity, do you mean generally or in a particular country?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, the affairs of one nation are so linked up with another that if you have a condition of great prosperity in one country there is usually world prosperity. But if you can have high prosperity in one country and not in others, I think that certainly you—

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The first immigrants here did not arrive because of the prosperity that preceded them. They surely created it.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Four hundred and fifty years ago the North American continent was inhabited by Indians.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: If I understand your statement right, there did not exist the prosperity and expansion in North America at that time to attract immigrants, and yet, in the centuries that followed, they came and developed a continent. Just the same as in the west; I do not think that would apply to western Canada. I do not think people went to western Canada for any other reason than that they thought that here was land which was cheap and easily available.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There were unmonopolized opportunities.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And the movement of people to western Canada was the factor in creating the expansion and prosperity which followed it. As I see it, I do not think that expansion and prosperity preceded immigration there.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, let us go back. You are talking about four or five hundred years back. Of course there are other motives for the movements of people beside the economic motive. I suppose the economic motive moved Columbus, too, but still he was an explorer. Jacques Cartier was an explorer; Champlain was an explorer. Some of these earlier people came for other reasons than purely economic motives. Or if you come down a little later in our history and take the case of the United Empire Loyalists, they came here under a certain amount of pressure. Conditions in the United States were such that they wanted to come into a country which still flew the British flag, and the economic motive, certainly, was not the only one. Nevertheless there were economic opportunities for them, because there was free land. They came in for these various reasons. You can point out different situations which caused movements of emigrants. We are not purely motivated by economic motives. But in so far as the West is concerned, I think it is true that the economic conditions developed first, and the movement of immigrants came afterwards. I think, if one studied the situation very carefully and did a good deal of research on it, you would find that most of the large movements of immigrants into the country could be definitely related with a period of prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Doctor, we are very much obliged to you.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I want to ask the Doctor a couple of questions. On these figures that you have given of the movement out of the country; have you been able to break down from what parts of the country the bulk of the movement took place?

Mr. MARSHALL: In one of our census volumes we have a study which shows the movement out of various counties. It shows how the movement gradually went westward in Canada, but we do not relate that to the movement out of the country. I think you would get some information which would be interesting to you on that question in this census volume.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You have not got it as to the occupations of people who moved out of the country?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. We have some information on that. We certainly have.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Would you know whether there were more artisans than agriculturists that moved out?

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I am afraid that so far as the migration out of Canada is concerned, we cannot break our statistics down into individual occupations.

The CHAIRMAN: The largest migration to Rhode Island and Massachusetts was from Quebec, was it not?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, that is right. That is textile workers.

The CHAIRMAN: From Quebec into Rhode Island and Massachusette?

Mr. MARSHALL: There was a heavy movement into New England from Quebec. I think the best way of clearing up the point you are interested in would be to get the information from the American side. Our figures would not be broken down into classifications or occupations, which you say you are interested in.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Doctor.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I want to put this on the record. You will remember that in the steering committee a suggestion was made that we should obtain some information from particular industries as to the need of labour.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And I suggested that we should obtain information from the sugar beet industry in Alberta. Last week they asked me to present, myself, to the committee the facts in regard to the industry. I asked them to submit an official statement so that it would come direct from the industry; and it came to me this morning. It is signed by the Alberta Sugar Beet Growers Association and by the Canadian Sugar Factories Limited. I think this should go on the record. I might say that they are speaking of their needs for three years in advance. This is somewhat of the form of planning—1948, 1949 and 1950; and they would need 500 beet workers each year; that would be largely families.

The CHAIRMAN: We will place that on record for the information of all concerned.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: By all means put it on.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: This is the document:—

#### LABOUR REQUIREMENTS FOR SUGAR BEET GROWING IN SOUTHERN ALBERTA

*Joint Submission to Senate Immigration Committee by Alberta Sugar Beet Growers Association and Canadian Sugar Factories Ltd.*

The Alberta Sugar Industry in 1946 grew 30,800 acres and 387,000 tons of sugar beets; producing for Canada approximately 106,000,000 lbs. of sugar.

This production was over 50 per cent of the sugar made in Canada, which had been requested by the Sugar Administrator, and assisted by Governmental support.

The Sugar Company has commenced construction of a third factory at Taber, Alberta, for operation in 1949—at an estimated cost of over \$3,500,000. The present factories at Raymond and Picture Butte, Alberta, have a daily slicing capacity of 3,100 tons of beets, and when the third unit is completed, there will be a daily slicing capacity of around 5,000 tons.



This means that if labour and markets are available the irrigated districts of Alberta can devote 45,000 to 50,000 acres to sugar beets, and process a crop of 600,000 tons maximum or a total production of 180,000,000 lbs. of sugar.

Over 20 years experience has proved to us that the ideal beet labour is that of farm families, and that Western Europeans have been most adaptable. Many such people from Denmark, Holland, Czechoslovakia and Austria-Hungary after some years of beet work have rented farms, and then have become owners of farms, and Canadian citizens.

We have no objection, however, to using groups of single men, provided they can be secured on the beet contract basis, as many of these Europeans soon send for their families and become established.

These developments will be necessary to fully utilize the irrigation waters of Southern Alberta under the program of water storage and development now under way by the Dominion and Provincial Governments. The first units of these development dams for storage water are now being built near Magrath and Spring Coulee, Alberta.

When completed an additional 350,000 acres will be brought under irrigation ditches.

In 1946 German POW's and Japanese families did the required hand work, on about 22,000 acres of beets. There is a loss of 1,400 German POW's and a probable loss of 400 to 500 Japanese workers to be replaced, if beet acreage is maintained for 1947.

We tabulate the class of labour used for sugar beets in 1946 below:

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per Cent</i>
Acres harvested .....	29,564	
Japanese .....	15,065	50.96
European .....	5,951	20.13
Mennonite .....	111	.37
Indian .....	172	.58
Family .....	4,105	13.89
P.O.W. ....	3,033	10.26
Miscellaneous .....	637	2.15
Mechanical .....	490	1.66

Early in 1947 the labour situation looked most desperate as there was a loss of 1,400 German Prisoners and approximately 500 Japanese workers who have moved on Eastward.

Submissions were made to the Government, and to all the Ministers involved, in January and February in conjunction with the growers and processors in other provinces. Alberta requested 1,000 workers be provided. To meet these requests we now expect that about 300 single Polish veterans and possibly about 30 Ukrainian families of displaced persons, will be placed in Alberta, in time for beet thinning in early June. We have no other additional farm labour in sight.

Unfortunately, this movement will not supply over 50 per cent of the labour which will be required. Consequently a number of good beet farmers are without labour and have reduced their contract and planted acreage of beets for 1947.

At this date, therefore, it appears likely there will be a loss of nearly 2,000 acres in beets planted this year as compared with 1946.

It is true that the Government, through the Sugar Administrator, has offered increased support payments for 1947 beets, intended to place the beet grower on a parity with the estimated costs of imported Cane Sugar.

No beet price established, however, will produce sugar beets unless adequate labour is provided. The story is practically written for 1947. We must look forward.



We submit the following as proposals for the next five years.

1948—provision for 500 beet workers—European families preferred—to reach Alberta about May 1, 1948.

1949—800 similar workers to provide for additional beet acreage for the Taber factory and replacements, arriving in April and May.

1950—600 workers to spread into new irrigated areas for spring arrival.

This program is modest, and we could assure the Government of complete placement of these people, if they are allowed entrance into Canada.

This submission is limited in extent to our own needs for sugar beets but it is our opinion that the new developments in irrigation will eventually provide for some 30,000 new farm people on the land in Southern Alberta.

We have proven, without doubt, that our soil, water and climate offer the finest possibilities for sugar production, intensive farming, livestock production, and heavy population, in all Western Canada.

The full development of our possibilities for sugar production will depend on the establishment of a National Sugar Policy, which would allow the expansion of the Beet Sugar Industry into markets now inaccessible, because of high and prohibitive freight rates.

Respectfully and Jointly Submitted,

ALBERTA SUGAR BEET GROWERS ASSOC.

PHILIP BAKER,

*President*

CANADIAN SUGAR FACTORIES LIMITED

T. GEO. WOOD,

*General Manager*

The Committee adjourned until June 4 at 10.30 a.m.











Gov. Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada. Immigration and Labour,  
Standing Committee, 1947

1947

(THE SENATE OF CANADA)



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 9

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

WITNESSES

- Mr. S. W. Fairweather, Vice-President of Research and Development,  
Canadian National Railways.  
Mr. J. S. McGowan, Director, Department of Colonization and Agriculture,  
Canadian National Railways.  
Mr. M. W. Maxwell, Chief of Development, Canadian National Railways.  
Mr. Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of  
the Secretary of State.  
Colonel C. A. Krug, Assistant Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch,  
Department of the Secretary of State.

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947

LIBRARY

JUN 19 1947

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 4th June, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Buchanan, Burchill, Daigle, Horner, Hushion, McDonald (*Shediac*), McGeer, Molloy, Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor, Vaillancourt and Wilson.—14.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Mr. S. W. Fairweather, Vice-President of Research and Development, Canadian National Railways, appeared and read a brief on the industrial and agricultural development of Canada and the railway's interest in immigration, and was questioned.

Mr. J. S. McGowan, Director, Department of Colonization and Agriculture, Canadian National Railways, appeared and read a brief on immigration to Canada, the shipping space available for immigrants, and the agricultural and industrial development in Canada, and was questioned.

Mr. M. W. Maxwell, Chief of Development, Canadian National Railways, appeared and read a brief on the physical factors bearing on the placement of increased population and the absorption of added population into Canadian industrial life, and was questioned.

Mr. Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, appeared and read a brief on Canadian Immigrant Training, and was questioned. Colonel C. A. Krug, Assistant Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State, was heard with respect to the training of immigrants in Canadian citizenship, and was questioned.

At 12.50 p.m., the Committee adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 5th June, instant, at 10.30. a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,  
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Who is the first witness?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The members of the committee will all remember the most excellent presentation and the very valuable information given to us last year by representatives of the Canadian National Railways. They very kindly consented to come back and supplement what was said on the last occasion and bring us up to date in the matter of our common research.

We have here with us to-day Mr. S. W. Fairweather, of the Department of Research and Development; Mr. J. S. McGowan, of the Department of Colonization and Agriculture; Mr. M. W. Maxwell, the Chief of Development, all of the Canadian National Railways. I believe Mr. Fairweather will take the first position; will you, Mr. Fairweather?

I may also say, while I am at it, that we have, in accordance with the Steering Committee's instructions, invited representatives from the Department of the Secretary of State to tell us what is going on in the matter of educating the immigrants who do arrive in the ways of Canada. Mr. Frank Foulds, the Director of Citizenship, and Colonel C. A. Krug, his chief assistant, are both here and will follow the railway speakers.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we start, I think we ought to welcome our distinguished friend the mayor of Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McGeer), whom we are glad to have with us on the committee this morning.

Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. W. FAIRWEATHER: Honourable Senators, in my submission to the honourable members of the committee in June last year I referred to the function of the Department of Research and Development in the development of natural resources and in the placement of industry I expressed our keen interest in matters that may affect or influence such developments and do so again.

In our numerous contacts with new industrial projects in the postwar years we have been impressed with the value to Canada, in her industrial growth, of the new skills developed in the highly diversified war industries; more particularly in lines of production involving high precision in which the human factor is of paramount importance.

I recall in the years preceding the war the dearth of workmen trained in some precision operations—more particularly in mechanical lines—the few localities in which trained workers in such lines were to be found and the full absorption of the few that were available. Our Canadian industry was in some measure still in its apprentice years with production in many lines out of balance with demand. The war industries, regrettable as their necessity has been, have, in an important measure, developed these skills to a point where the products of Canadian workmanship have in many lines equalled, if not surpassed, in quality those of foreign countries of long industrial experience. It has been reported that the best small arms ammunition produced by any of the allied countries was made in a Canadian arsenal employing men and women many of whom had little or no previous industrial experience. The personnel of one of our



largest plants producing guns was in large part recruited from a farming population, many of whom have resumed that occupation. In addition, particularly in the mechanical, electrical and chemical fields, Canada produced in wartime many lines that her normal production would never have visualized. This new Canadian industrial versatility has been further enhanced by the release into productive and technical pursuits of the returned man whose intensive war training has developed skills and aptitudes that cannot fail of effect on Canadian production, while those who have elected postwar retraining in our schools and universities will soon make their technically-trained weight felt in Canadian industry and commerce.

The trend is increasingly toward a broader production; a widening in our lines of consumers' goods for export, and increasingly diversified production. While Canada with her wheat, her lumber, her base metals and other mineral products will continue to be a heavy exporter of raw materials, her progress in their conversion to consumers' goods will increase.

On the other hand, employment in the basic agricultural and other extractive industries, i.e., mining, lumbering, etc., has fallen out of line with production in those fields. In agriculture, for instance, the rapid increase in the use of improved and more efficient agricultural machinery; extension of the use of fertilizer and pest controls; improvements in agricultural methods and the introduction of grain and other seeds and plant strains better adapted to Canadian conditions, increasingly tend to raise production not only per unit of employment but per unit of land occupation. The size of the farm increases and the farm employment and occupation declines. This is already apparent in parts of Western Canada where the population has been falling off in the face of normal if not increased agricultural production. The same trend may be observed in metal mining, lumbering and fishing where production per unit of employment is trending upward due to increasing mechanization and improved techniques. The result is what might well be expected—not only have workers in war industries drawn from agriculture and other extractive employment been inclined to continue in industry and to reestablish themselves in industrial areas but there has been a noticeable shift of population to industrial cities marked by declines in rural population.

What I wish to make clear is that this decline is not accompanied by a falling off in agricultural and other extractive production. The fact is that the basic extractive industries increasingly tend to produce more with less people.

Studies looking to the formulation of an immigration policy, from this viewpoint, seek an answer to the following questions:—

Should we move to increase agricultural population to the limit of available land with corresponding extensions of railway and highway facilities?

Will the world economy admit of profitable future markets for increased grain production?

What agricultural products might replace a declining world demand for Canadian grain?

What should be the optimum population for Canada?

I must confess that I have not got the answer to these questions but I would submit that any large increase in our agricultural population must visualize the extension of agricultural settlement in sections that in our current economy can only be regarded as marginal. The better lands, as developed, will continue to be merged into larger units adapted to operation on a more economical scale, with a small proportion of farmers falling back through less favourable situations, to the point of subsistence farming.

It is true that a great part of the world's agriculture is conducted on a subsistence basis; the question is how far can Canada go in this direction and still maintain the standards of human values and culture that combine to promote national greatness.

The railway's interest in immigration lies in the prospect of increased gross and net revenue. The railway can have little interest in immigrants who would carry on at subsistence level. The average per capita gross earnings of Canadian railways lies between \$50 and \$70 per year, of which from \$10 to \$15 remains after payment of operating expenses. Inferentially, immigration leads to increased business activity and more traffic for the railway. More traffic, however, under average conditions, means that more capital must be invested in the railway for additional equipment, additional facilities, and possibly for branch line extensions. These economic factors set limits to the value of immigration to railways, because if it is assumed that the average immigrant is as productive as the average Canadian, the amount of capital which the railway could justifiably spend per immigrant is \$150.00 to \$175.00. If more than this amount is expended, the railway industry would be adversely affected. In contrast to these figures it might be pointed out that the present investment per capita on Canadian railways is \$274.00.

The point I wish to make is that to be beneficial to the railway industry, a high level of productivity is needed. This high level of productivity can only be attained by mechanization. As has been pointed out earlier in this memorandum, mechanization has been progressing at a rapid rate in Canada, and in the primary and extractive industries we probably produce as much per capita as any country in the world. The process is continuing. Each year sees advances. The agricultural, lumbering and mining industries, and more latterly the fishing industry, are becoming increasingly mechanized. One of the results is to produce a condition which is the equivalent of immigration at the rate of about 250,000 people per year. We can see the social effect of this trend in the reduction in rural and an increase in urban population. We can see it too in the dependence of our economy on foreign trade. I read recently that one job in ten in the United States was dependent upon that country's foreign trade. The corresponding figure in Canada is more nearly one job in three.

If we consider the problem of immigration in relation to opportunity for trade expansion and of standard of living, some doubts arise as to the timing if immigration. We must remember that a program of mechanization is probably the most efficient means of increasing production. Markets for the increased production from this source must be found or, as an alternative, there must be emigration or a decrease in employment. I repeat, the effect of mechanization is the equivalent of 250,000 immigrants per year. If markets can be found at a more rapid rate than the increased production so created, then immigration would aid and assist in a further increase in the standard of living, otherwise not. It is in the mechanization of the primary and extractive industries of Canada that I find the answer to the comparatively slow growth in the population of Canada and to the fact that notwithstanding substantial immigration there has been also emigration. Believing as I do that the measure of human progress is not mere numbers but an increased standard of living, I do not consider this situation as an unfortunate one. Canada is a land of great opportunity. She may be expected to increase substantially in population, and I should hope that this increase in population would not be at the expense of a decrease in the standard of living. This objective can only be reached if we continue as in the past to use applied science to minimize human labour and substitute for it the power of the machine.

Mr. Maxwell will have something to say as to the physical features bearing upon placement of added population.

That, Mr. Chairman, completes my formal submission.

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder, Mr. Fairweather, if you would turn to page 3 and give us, or me, a little further information on what you mean by this: "I would submit that any large increase in our agricultural population must visualize the extension of agricultural settlement in sections that in our current economy can only be regarded as marginal." What do you mean by these last words, "can only be regarded as marginal"?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I am speaking in an economic sense, Senator. The amount of land that has been settled in Canada for production of agricultural products for export has necessarily been the land that under current economic conditions fulfilled the test of being profitable. Now, if you go further, if you add to that production, it seems to me self-evident that such lands will be marginal as compared with the existing lands. That is only an application of a general economic theory of the law of diminishing returns. We have not in Canada an unending amount of land which is equal in opportunity; that is, that has the desired fertility, that has access to markets, that has transportation facilities, and that has all those factors which are on a par with the existing occupied land. The best of the existing land has already been developed. Now if we expand, however, we must go into land that is somewhat lower in its productivity than the land that has already been developed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The margin of cultivation is a well-known economic term.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Of course, there is a change from year to year. Our pine has been taken off and we are looking for soft wood in New Brunswick. I know that Charlotte County was once a wonderful land for pine but there is nothing left now. We have wasted our resources.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: About the production of lumber in Eastern Canada, it is a fact that it is going on at a larger scale than it ever has in the past. That is part of what I was referring to here in this memorandum when I mentioned the effect of mechanization upon production.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What is the object of this presentation?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Simply to give the committee, upon their request, some information.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Is it just Information?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Tobacco agriculture has been profitable on lands that have been condemned. I heard about a Belgian who bought property for a few hundred dollars for which land he refused thousands of dollars only a few years after. Everything changes.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I should not want to have it inferred that we have exhausted the technical ability to make increasing use of our land. That is not my thought at all. I was speaking of average conditions. There are undoubtedly exceptional opportunities in Canada in every line of activity. Canada is a country of great opportunity, but the point I wish to make in this memorandum is that if we exploit that opportunity in anything like the pattern we have in the past then we must depend upon foreign trade to make use of that production. That is the basic idea in this memorandum.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Except as our cities and our economies become better balanced:



Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That of course is true, Senator, but that is a slow process. After all, our standard of living in Canada depends to a greater degree upon foreign trade than it does with any other country in the world that I know of.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course, if we increase our population we shall have a larger consuming public.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That is admitted, but mathematically it is a function of time, as I have endeavoured to point out. We cannot have our cake and eat it.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I should like to ask this question, and I quote from your brief: "The effect of mechanization is the equivalent of 250,000 immigrants per year". How do you get that figure?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Well, I get it from the state of the increased productivity of Canadian labour.

The CHAIRMAN: It is just an estimate?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Certainly, all these things must be estimates, but, as applied to the Canadian National Railway, for instance, I know perfectly well that that is what is happening. Every year we increase the efficiency of the railway's operations so that we do the same equivalent work with fewer hands, and the result of that is that there are more hands available in the country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are including all industries and not just the farming industry?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: All industries.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: If you take the figures on gross production and divide the population into them from year to year and from time to time you get that increase?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I think it is pretty generally accepted from studies that have been made, not only by myself but by many economists, that the increment, due to technological advantages, is about 2% of the annual production. That is a figure that has been established by very careful study. That is a remarkable figure, Senators, as there is no other country in the world which can equal that, not even the United States.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Would that not vary from year to year?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: No. I am not talking about the technological aspect of it. Each year we pour into industries improved processes and improved methods, and by that means we increase the productivity per man hour about two per cent a year. That is a most remarkable factor and something that we as Canadians should be very, very proud of if we believe fundamentally that from an economic surplus springs an increased standard of living. It shows a youth and fertility that is most remarkable.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am told that in preparing new land for agriculture—I am thinking of our own province where the land is grown over by forests—their method of running the plow over the roots and tossing the stumps out of the way with heavy power has been a great help.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That is a good illustration. I had an opportunity last fall of seeing what was being done along that line in Northern Quebec, which province I would say has gone further along in that line than any other. It is truly remarkable the improvement in the man-hour content of preparing land for settlement as compared with methods that were being used thirty or forty years ago. It is just revolutionary.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, I have seen men still in their early years who have become knotted and deformed from the hard work of the terrible job of clearing the land in those days.



Mr. FAIRWEATHER: It is most remarkable the development that is made by the modern bulldozing equipment.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, perhaps some of the submarginal land will now be marginal.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Oh, yes, senator, distinctly. I do not wish to say in this memorandum that we have exhausted our capacity to produce, economically, food products as compared with other countries in this world. We still have a numerous capacity to expand. What I was discussing here was a relative situation, relative to what we have done already. To what we must necessarily consider the idea that if you do increase your production where are you going to sell it? Certainly three-fourths of our Canadian agricultural production must find markets overseas, or to the south of us if the United States would lower the tariff barriers. If they would do that we would make a happy living producing food for them. That is one of the crazy things that there is in the world today. I am necessarily bound in my memorandum by the conditions that are set for me.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It is a very thoughtful memorandum that you have given to us, Mr. Fairweather. I do not know what Senator McDonald meant, but you certainly gave us some valuable information.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What I want to know is, what are you asking that we should do as a committee here in connection with the different problems that you have outlined? What do you want us to do? What can we do?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I simply summed it up in this memorandum. I spoke for the Canadian National Railway and I pointed out the limits in which immigration can be beneficial to the railway. I cannot encompass the whole field of the Canadian economy; I have simply contributed some information to your committee. I merely suggest that if we want to maintain our Canadian standard of living, and if we are confined by this constructive force of increasing technological improvement, then we should give a bit of care to the timing of immigration in relation to world markets. That is really what I am saying.

The CHAIRMAN: And that we should set the number at 250,000 individuals a year.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: No, I did not say that, senator. I say that you have got that number to take care of anyway. Every year 250,000 people in Canada have to look for new jobs. That is the result of technological improvement. Now, fortunately our technological advances and our general fertility is capable of absorbing that number without decreasing our standard of living. On the average we do find employment for them, and our standard of living has been going up from year to year. I say that that is a healthy sign.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): How are you going to increase that?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I do not know that you have to increase that. That is my point. I say that that is a matter for debate. All I am saying is that so far as the railways are concerned you have got to get a person capable of high productivity. We have got to spend capital; the Canadian National Railway has got to spend capital to bring immigrants into this country. I have already told you that if you can presume that an immigrant is as productive as the average Canadian—and that is a pretty big assignment—then the amount of capital that the railways can justifiably spend to create opportunities for work is about the figure I mentioned \$170 a year.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fairweather, I wonder if you would give us your view on the statement made by Dr. Marshall here, that since 1851, where one hundred immigrants came to Canada, ninety-one immigrants went to the United States, leaving us an increase of nine out of the one hundred people who came here.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That is a fact. I do not consider it a terrible thing. I can say this, that if we in Canada were trying to have our productivity that we have to-day with the standards of 140 years ago, the population would have to be thirty million people. I think it is a very fine thing that we can produce with eleven million people what thirty million people would be required to produce in 1900, and I do not think that is a backward thing at all. I think, quite on the contrary, that it is a most remarkable piece of work.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: If there was a market for increased production—I am not saying where—but, if there was a market then your argument would not hold would it? If we had an endless export market that could take care of the food we could produce, then your submission this morning would not hold, would it?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: It would still apply. What I am saying is just exactly that. I am saying that immigrants to this country must be keyed to the ability to get export markets. When you get export markets, then Canada can go on, as far as I can see, a very considerable distance.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Then it is largely a matter of export markets.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That is the gist of my memorandum: Canadian economy is one that is keyed to world markets. Per capita we are practically the greatest trading nation in the world.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: So that as there are many millions of people in the world to-day, say, in the Far East countries, whose standards of living are far below ours and need a lot of the things that Canada produces, if human wisdom could devise some way of giving these people or making it possible for these people to have these things, our problem here would be solved. Is that correct?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I cannot quite see it as a problem, but I do say that if the dragon of economic nationalism could be destroyed, Canada as a country would flourish like the green bay tree, because we have what the world needs; we can produce cheaper than any other countries of the world, and if the channels of trade could be opened out we would go ahead by leaps and bounds and immigrants would come to Canada because it was a land of opportunity.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is a very important point, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Fairweather, in this memorandum you have expressed some concern from the standpoint of the railway, less the immigrants we bring in are not as productive as the present population, which would result in substandards of living. You are worried about the amount of money which the railway might have to expend in consequence of an increase in the population. Consider this, that the productivity of mankind has increased so greatly since the first expenditures made by the railway that to-day the immigrant coming here and joining in our mechanized civilization would produce so much more—you have just given us the information that on the basis of production some years ago Canada would require 30,000,000 people—that any fear on the part of the railway about the productivity of the unit is unnecessary.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Mr. Senator, I assume the productivity equal to the present average production.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Suppose that it even fell below, there is still nothing for the railway to worry about.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: There is something for the railway to worry about if as a concomitant we have to build branch lines.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You had to build main lines at one time.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Yes. I would be the last one to say that the railway industry is outmoded in the development of the country. I do not want to leave

that impression at all. I say so that to improve the balance sheet of the Canadian National Railways the immigrant has to have a high productivity, or we cannot afford to spend more than about a \$150.00 per immigrant in providing additional facilities to make opportunities for him to work. That is just an estimate of the position. I am assuming a high level of productivity, equal to the highest average in Canada. I simply say that under those conditions if immigrants are brought into the country, and as a consequence we require an expansion of railway facilities to provide opportunities, then we can justify spending \$150 per immigrant.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I have in mind a picture of our building branch lines to-day through a newly settled country, cleared with bull-dozers, ploughed with gang ploughs, reaped with the modern machinery, as compared with the struggles of the poor settlers of fifty years ago when you built the main lines for their accommodation—

The CHAIRMAN: You might add "and paid for by Federal money."

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is true; it was paid for by Canadians.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I think when we look back on it, it was a very good chore.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It was a good chore, and it might have been done cheaper.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Three lines were put in where one would do.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That might be argued.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And a good many people became wealthy through the process.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There are thousands of acres to-day where all you need is water; the railway is built there and you are receiving scarcely any revenue.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: That is admitted. My submission is purely in relation to the railway. There are opportunities in Canada adjacent to existing railways, where expansion could take place. In Eastern Canada, at least, we had to build a branch line; we are building one now fundamentally for the agricultural and pulpwood industries.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Mr. Fairweather, you have stressed the need for exports. The Senate Committee had a witness before it—Dr. Johnston, I believe—who claimed that if Canada were pushed into the ocean where it was impossible to trade a dollar's worth with any other country, that there would be abundant living for ten times the present population. What do you think of that?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I would not care to comment on it.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I am inclined to believe it myself.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think we have the thought to-day that we cannot enjoy a high standard of living when the rest of the world is very low.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I do not agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN: We are much obliged to you Mr. Fairweather for your submission. Who is the next witness?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The next witness is Mr. J. S. McGowan, Director of the Department of Colonization and Agriculture, Canadian National Railways.

Mr. J. S. MCGOWAN: Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the Senate Committee:

I appreciate the opportunity of being here to-day to present some additional evidence to you. May I say at the outset that I consider this committee is performing a very useful function in serving as a clearing house



for opinions on this all-important problem of immigration. Your report of last year and the many expressions of opinion from your members have been extremely helpful in developing public opinion and providing a better public understanding of the many problems involved.

In the statement which I presented to this committee last year, I endeavoured to outline in some detail the work of my department in immigration and in the general development of the lands served by our company's lines. I reviewed the situation in the British Isles and other European countries to show that many people desire to come here and establish new homes. I emphasized that, contrary to the general opinion, a constructive movement of new people to Canada could not be developed or built up overnight; that it required not only shipping facilities but also careful planning and organization; that the opportunities for expansion in Canada were greater to-day than at earlier stages of our history. I reviewed the land situation, the possibilities in the west through irrigation and the necessity for resettlement in many of our older areas. These and other points were enumerated to show that we have an abundance of natural wealth and opportunity to provide for a steady and progressive development program that would be beneficial to our country and to our people.

My remarks to-day will be brief and intended merely to supplement my previous submission. While the general situation has not changed materially during the past twelve months, we can see more clearly the problems with which we are likely to be faced in our efforts to increase our population. Here are the basic facts of the immigration picture as I see them at this time.

(1) There are many good immigrants from the British Isles and other countries in Europe applying for admission. A statement issued in October of last year showed that 150,000 people in the British Isles had registered their intention of coming to Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Who made that statement?

Mr. McGOWAN: It appeared as a statement in the British press.

In the last few months of 1946 my department was able to secure shipping space for about 200 British immigrants. That was at the time when shipping space was at a premium. This small group had capital to the extent of approximately half a million dollars. I quote this to illustrate the type of British settlers applying for admission at this time. The situation in other European countries has been covered fully in previous submissions to your Committee and requires no further comment from me at this time.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: May I interrupt to ask if there is any limitation on the amount of money the British immigrants are allowed to bring out?

Mr. McGOWAN: Yes. It is £5,000 over a period of four years.

(2) Under present Canadian Government regulations, we could bring in a reasonable number of new people.

(3) On the negative side, this prospective movement is severely restricted by the lack of shipping accommodation and the regulations in some countries covering the transfer of capital. I made reference to both of these last year. There is also a tremendous demand for tourist space. The tourist business just now requires little or no solicitation and naturally every effort is being made to accommodate as many as possible with the ships available. However, it very definitely reduces the amount of space available for immigrants and will continue to do so for some time. Unless additional shipping is provided for an immigrant movement, the numbers likely to be brought forward in 1947 and 1948 will be pitifully small.

As a direct result of these conditions, we can easily divide the whole question of future immigration to Canada into two very distinct divisions. First, a program to cover the immediate future and to meet the special



conditions that prevail to-day and, secondly, the long-range policy to provide this country with a bigger population. Dealing first with the problem of meeting present-day conditions, it becomes all too apparent that a very special effort will have to be made to secure additional shipping facilities. I hesitate to make reference to this question again but I do so for the simple reason that the whole case stands or falls on this particular point. May I respectfully suggest to this Committee that particular attention be given to this problem. It requires your closest study if an immigration movement for next year of any consequence is to be developed to meet the productive needs of this country. The Board of Trade regulations governing the operation of ships by commercial companies will eliminate some vessels that might be available for carrying immigrants and which have been employed in transporting troops under Government control. While some additional shipping will be available later this year and in 1948, it will be totally inadequate to meet our immediate requirements. The problem of additional immigrant shipping space, therefore, becomes one of Government concern.

Dealing with the question of long-range policy, in which we are all particularly interested, we are fully aware that any consideration of this subject is so far reaching in relation to the whole future of our country that it calls for the widest possible study and a full and complete understanding of the value of the immigrant in our economy. In this connection, may I say that in the early part of this century Canadians had a vision and enthusiasm for immigration such as is not apparent to-day. One outstanding editorial writer pointed out recently that, in spite of our present favourable background, Canadians remain haunted by the fears of the economic insecurities of the past and the 1930's hang like a poisonous fog over our thinking. It is very true that the unemployment and overproduction of the '30's still seem to dominate our approach to this question. It seems difficult to eliminate the fear that new people would take away the jobs that our own people should have, and yet, if the history of the past is any guide, it does prove that, as each wave of new immigrants reached our shores, new developments took place providing more and greater opportunities for our own people.

Last year I made a passing reference also to the effect on public opinion of those people who often refer to this country adding millions of new people to our population. I pointed out that it left the impression that we were likely to be swamped by too many. We have been plagued by this fear that we might get more than we could absorb, and this thought alone has influenced to a marked extent our national thinking.

I would like to pause to elaborate this a little further, and it is particularly as a result of some evidence which was presented to his committee, because I think that this habit of people referring to millions or to other large numbers we are likely to get does influence Canadian opinion on this question of immigration. For example, one witness said that we should get 500,000 people a year. I can see no possibility of either recruiting or bringing forward 500,000 people to this country for some considerable time.

I want also to refer to another point. Mr. Pat Conroy, secretary of the Canadian Congress of Labour, referred in his evidence to this question of number. He was concerned about it. He stated: "I think it is fair to say that the sentiment of the people of Canada, regardless of their social, political or economic beliefs, is that Canada must have more people". He went further and remarked, "We have this extremely large country with virtually only a handful of people inside of it; and because of the uncertain world situation many of us are quite worried lest if we do not look after our heritage we may lose it." Both of these statements are sound. However, he very definitely asked this question: "When we talk about more people coming to Canada, what

actually are we thinking about? Are we thinking of boatload after boatload of anonymous individuals coming from undefined nations to land in Canada?... or, are we thinking in terms of hundreds of thousands and maybe ultimately millions of thousands coming to this country and making it a greater nation that it now is?" That is the point I want to emphasize, this point dealing with the question of how many people Canada can absorb and how many we are likely to secure. It needs clarification in the minds of the Canadian people. Now I will go on with my text.

Perhaps when it becomes widely known that we are going to find it extremely difficult to meet our most pressing requirements then we are likely to develop a better understanding and a keener appreciation of the value of willing hands to help us do some of the hard work of expanding our present limited range of development. There is undoubtedly a growing public interest in immigration, but there are still many reservations and doubts. To develop a long-term constructive policy, public opinion must stem from a deep conviction that increased population is vital and necessary to the future welfare of our people and our country.

Canada to-day represents one of the richest and at the same time one of the most underpopulated countries in the world. There is no other country in the temperate zone with a greater variety of natural resources. This simple fact is to-day very well known and recognized in other countries. I have often asked the question, "Can we hope to maintain this position in a world that is overcrowded, and that is also admittedly underfed and undernourished?" It is difficult to believe that in this new world that has become so small we can refuse to share some of our living room and at the same time expect to trade freely with those countries that have a surplus of people. Take for example the case of Holland, with over 9 million people, a population that is rapidly increasing, and with well over 700 people to the square mile. Representatives of the Dutch Government frankly admit that a good percentage of their people must be established elsewhere, and their emigration director visited Canada last year to explore the possibilities. It has been established also that Dutch people have a preference for Canada, and it is freely admitted that Dutch people make excellent settlers.

In any consideration of a long-range program, in any examination, any analysis of our position to-day, if it be practical and thorough, we are forced to the conclusion that our future is dependent to a very great extent on what our immigration policy will be. We are at that stage where we might look forward with confidence to a period of comparatively rapid growth. While the comparison may not be entirely justified, it is a fact that the United States at a somewhat similar stage did make rapid strides in development, largely through increased population. In an address given a short time ago, I pointed out that since the first railway was built the population of the world has more than doubled. The railways made possible the development of lands that had been regarded as inaccessible, permitting the world's physical resources to be brought more fully into use to provide more opportunities and more food for mankind. In this illustration, we can see Canada's future more clearly. Lands, minerals, forests, the many development projects in sight, coupled with our industrial expansion, can provide a new era of population increase. We have to-day in Canada approximately 12,300,000 people, which represents a net gain of 800,000 between 1941 and 1946. The major gains during this five-year period were as follows: Ontario 319,000; Quebec 298,000; British Columbia 185,000, while the Prairie Provinces showed a loss of 65,000. In connection with the latter figure, there has been undoubtedly a steady drain of labour from our farms in the West to lumber camps and other industrial jobs in the East.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What about the Maritimes? Have you left them out altogether?

Mr. McGOWAN: In the Maritimes the change was not sufficient to justify my making special reference to them, senator.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is the forgotten part of Canada.

Mr. McGOWAN: I had the figures for all the provinces; but these were the major changes. That is what I mean.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is the tendency nowadays.

Mr. McGOWAN: No, I would not leave the Maritimes out of the picture.

You have had presented to you an expert analysis of the labour situation in Canada. That showed an estimated shortage of 35,000 to 44,000 and it was admitted frankly that the figures were conservative. Our own *Labour Gazette* has referred to the shortage of men for mining and lumbering. One of the lumber companies spent \$150,000 to get a supply of labour last winter. A recent report indicated that one of the mining companies had a labour force of slightly over 1,000 and that they hoped to build this up to their pre-war level of 1,800. Many references have also been made to the question of farm labour. These are the highlights only of the over-all picture. In connection with this general labour picture, the points I would emphasize are:—

- (a) Our whole post-war policy of reconstruction is dependent to a great extent on an adequate labour supply.
- (b) Available capital for the extension of our mining industry and other new developments cannot be utilized fully as long as the shortage lasts.
- (c) If development and production in our primary industries are restricted due to labour supply, employment and business in our secondary industries will be restricted likewise.

In spite of the many advances which we have made in the science of farming, we still have a long way to go in the development of our farm lands and in the more efficient use of the lands presently occupied, apart altogether from the settlement of our new lands. We do know that in the years ahead much resettlement will have to be carried out in our older settled areas and most of this will have to be done by immigrant farm settlers. In pursuing this policy, we must never lose sight of the fact that the greatness of this country has been built on our productive soils and that our farm lands and farm homes will continue to be the foundation of our economic life. For this reason we must view with alarm the trend in our falling rural population, because no growth of cities or wealth can compensate for the loss in either the number or character of our farm population. Our farm population must be maintained and we will need many new families for this purpose—those who at present are so anxious and willing to avail themselves of the opportunities that we have in this country.

In the development of a long-term policy, I am strongly in favour also of “relative” immigration—by “relative” immigration I mean, people coming to relatives in Canada—and here I feel we can be reasonably generous in our application of rules and regulations. Where the investigation discloses that the nominator in Canada is a respectable citizen and in a position to assist the incoming immigrant, then every encouragement should be provided. There is little or no problem of absorption and the question of aftercare is to a very large extent eliminated. At this point, I should like also to add my voice to those who have made appeals on behalf of displaced persons. Relatives of these people in Canada are pathetically eager to save them. Anything that we can do to meet this immediate problem will reflect greatly to the credit of our country and benefit us more than those who receive a welcome at our hands. I believe also that our approach to this problem will be a big factor in the development of good citizenship.



We should not restrict our immigrants to unskilled labour and those for settlement on the land. Industrially we are young and the admission of people with skills and new techniques should be very helpful in our progress. Great Britain and the United States have benefited from such additions to their population.

In the immigration countries of the world there appears to-day to be a definite policy to increase immigration, provided the migrants can make a contribution in labour or development. This represents an analysis of a comprehensive report of the International Labour Office. While Canada is in a favourable position and highly regarded by intending migrants, we shall be faced in the future with considerable competition in securing desirable types of settlers. We must recognize that progress in developing a constructive movement may be slow. It took us six or seven years after the first war before a movement of any size was built up. The conditions affecting migration and the world situation to-day are much more difficult than after the First World War.

In Canada to-day our universities are crowded with young men preparing themselves for the future and, unless we have a greater development, it will be extremely difficult to use all of these trained men to advantage. Where the population is small, as ours is, the opportunities for university-trained men are naturally restricted. This is the basic reason for losing some of them. We are concerned, and rightly so, over this situation but we are doing little or nothing to develop a movement from the United States to Canada to help balance our loss. In past years we have received many excellent settlers from south of the border and there are indications now that, with some encouragement, a much bigger flow could be developed. During the fiscal year ending March, 1947, we received from the United States a total of 11,410, compared with 7,454 for the previous year. May I respectfully suggest to this Committee that we should develop a program to bring to the attention of the United States people the many opportunities that Canada has to offer.

In concluding this brief general statement, I should like to submit that from my own experience in immigration and development work I am convinced that the admission of more people will benefit our country and I believe that the past definitely proves this. At the moment we are much too dependent on export markets and, until we have a bigger population, this factor will be a controlling influence on our economy. In the various submissions to this Committee, it has been demonstrated conclusively that immigration in the past has been largely responsible for the progress and prosperity that we enjoy to-day and that our urban and industrial growth followed as a natural consequence the settlement of our vast areas of land by our immigrant families. In developing a new policy for the years ahead, we will require the co-ordinated effort of all those interested. Our planning must take into consideration the question of a permanent shipping service to meet the needs of this country in immigration, tourists and trade. Steamship companies have emphasized to the Honourable Members of this Committee the cost of reconditioning ships, the very high cost of building new ones, and they regard the question of immigration policy as particularly important from the standpoint of future business. These are facts that cannot be avoided if we are to have a shipping service commensurate with the needs of our country.

It is generally acknowledged that the railways have made a great contribution to Canada's past development, and I am satisfied they will continue to do so. Their stake in Canada's future is large. Speaking for my own Department of the Canadian National Railways, I can say that with a well-trained, experienced staff, some with more than 25 years' experience in Canada and overseas, we are prepared to do our share in developing and maintaining a constructive immigration movement.



Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: In the early part of your statement you made reference to a hundred and fifty thousand people in the British Isles having registered their intention of coming to Canada. How did you obtain that figure?

Mr. McGOWAN: It was published in the press of the Old Country; and you may have seen also a statement made recently by the Premier of Ontario that over one hundred thousand applications had been received by their office overseas for Ontario alone.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought it said one hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. McGOWAN: I think the figure he used was about one hundred and twenty-five thousand for Ontario. But this was away last October.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: We will be including the Maritimes; we can have the twenty-five thousand.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You maintain an office in London?

Mr. McGOWAN: Yes. We have an office in London.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Are the people who inquire at your place about coming to Canada mechanics, or are they people who would like to go on the land? What types of people are they?

Mr. McGOWAN: We have many people applying to us about coming out here to settle on the land. Most of these are people who have sufficient means to come out and purchase farms for themselves, in Ontario or in any of our settled provinces. We have people of all types and classes applying for admission to Canada, or at least asking for information on Canada and desirous of coming here, men with skills who want to come out here for employment, and so on. It covers a very wide range of people, but there is no doubt about their desire to come here.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGowan, that is a very informative statement.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I suppose that you have to make your observations on the indication of the trend on the part of the Americans coming into Canada.

Mr. McGOWAN: I have always believed that we should do a little more than we are doing at the present time to sell Canada to Americans. I believe we have many opportunities to offer to the people of the United States to come in here and make new homes. Our effort at the present time is practically nil.

The CHAIRMAN: What plan would you suggest for making Canadian opportunities known to the people of the United States, advertisements?

Mr. McGOWAN: We do an excellent job; the government and the two railway companies do an excellent job in developing the tourist trade, and I think we could repeat that insofar as bringing people in here to make permanent homes.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: In your opinion, how many people, skilled and unskilled, could we absorb per year?

Mr. McGOWAN: It is difficult at the moment to give any definite figure as to what this country could absorb at the present time. We do know there is a big demand for labour at the moment, but the answer is that we are not going to get the people to meet our present demands.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Due to shipping?

Mr. McGOWAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It is hard for me to accept that argument. They are still building and selling ships to Russia and to Yugoslavians. There are people crossing, not in first class passenger ships, but in ships, and it is my opinion that this accommodation would be gladly used by most people who are desirous

of coming here as immigrants. I find it difficult at this time to accept the story that there is not enough shipping space. I cannot understand that argument.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: When some private person wants to bring some people here he can fly them across the ocean or get special transportation for them. When it was the desire to bring in the Polish group there was no difficulty at all encountered. The picture seems to me to be that the private shipping companies are unable to meet the demand because of Board of Trade regulations, and therefore they have had to say that the matter is on the level of government policy and government activity. We got busy here not long since and secured the Aquitania to run to Canada. We would not have had her if it had not been for government activity.

Mr. McGOWAN: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am satisfied that if real activity was undertaken by the government we could meet this shipping question.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: There was no difficulty in getting shipping space for 500 Yugoslavians leaving the country. What do you think of that?

Mr. McGOWAN: I think the answer is as Senator Roebuck just stated.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I wish to refer to the paragraph which you have just read and to say that it is a magnificent one: "I am strongly in favour also of relative immigration—by 'relative' immigration I mean, people coming to relatives in Canada—and here I feel that we can be reasonably generous in our application of rules and regulations. Where the investigation discloses that the nominator in Canada is a respectable citizen and in a position to assist the incoming immigrant, then every encouragement should be provided. There is little or no problem of absorption and the question of after care is to a very large extent eliminated."

Mr. McGOWAN, I strongly agree with the position that you have expressed so forcefully, and I wish to reemphasize it.

We have brought that type of immigrant; the very best and surest here. We brought 102 in the last year and I cannot believe that is our capacity to handle that type of immigrant. My sympathy is strongly stirred for Canadian citizens who have friends and relatives abroad, and I think that our government should do something positive in the bringing of those people over here. They should send a battleship if it is necessary.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: One of the causes for the depletion of settlement in Western Canada is partly because of labourers coming east, but the people who settled the West forty or fifty years ago have now gone to British Columbia, and were it not for the various nefarious interferences by the provincial governments that place a man in such a position that he is afraid to sell his land on time, there would be thousands of opportunities for men of good character to buy land in the West when the people are willing to retire and set up homes. However, they are refusing to sell the farms other than for cash, and that practice is handicapping settlement and is running the very people this resolution has tried to help.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McGowan, we are very much obliged to you, sir, for your splendid report.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I should like to make this observation: If we had handled the evacuation from Dunkirk the way we have brought over our relatives to America, we would have lost an army.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: With regard to steamers coming over, a few weeks ago we had some steamship company representatives here and I gathered from their report and remarked that there was no chance of getting immigrants

over to this country. I undertook in my own way to have an examination made of this situation and I found that the American government have some Liberty ships lying in American harbours doing nothing. Those ships could be purchased at a very reasonable price. Those are the ships that were used to transfer troops throughout the war years. When they talk about boats being scarce in supply that fact may be true in so far as first-class boats are concerned, but, when your father and my father came to this country they did not come over in the *Queen Elizabeth*. Surely if these people who are in such desperate need as we are led to believe them to be, wish to come over to this country, they could come in such boats as these Liberty ships. Even the railway companies, to give people a less expensive ride, had people sitting up in day coaches from coast to coast. If you were going to Vancouver or Halifax you could travel that way and it did not hurt anybody. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why there is such talk about getting immigrants here. If you have got people who want to come here, and if it is only a question of transportation, surely the railway men and transportation people would have less difficulty than I did in finding out that there are a few boats available right now. You may have to buy them, and you certainly would have to charter them.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Did not the steamship people tell us that those boats were not fit?

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Yes, but that is like many things you have been told. These ships are being sold for as much as \$1,000,000. If people are paying that much you would not think they would buy them if they were not fit. And are you not referring to Canadian ships?

The CHAIRMAN: The argument was that boats that were capable and fit to transport troops to Europe were not fit to bring men and their wives and families to Canada.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Certainly they would be. If you have people wanting to come, it is the duty of the government who desires them to immigrate here to secure one or two of those boats. If there is such a necessity for getting them here this could be done.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Australia has chartered a ship, and they have been performing that service continually.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I should like to ask Mr. Fairweather a question if I may. He said something about every immigrant costing \$150 to \$175. What does he base that on?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fairweather said that?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: No, that is not what I said. I did not say it cost that at all.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Well, I think you have it here in black and white.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I said that that is the maximum amount of capital that the Canadians could afford to spend to create an opportunity.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Why would you be expected to spend at least \$150 a head?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: You cannot have industries without opportunity, and you cannot have opportunities without transportation.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: We have the transportation to bring in that quantity of people. You have lots of railroads and cars.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood that that was the estimated cost of transportation from overseas to Canada.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: No, that is the capital that the railway would be justified in spending to create an economic opportunity.



Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I cannot quite see what you base that on, Mr. Fairweather.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fairweather.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Mr. Fairweather did not answer my question. I do not know why you are hurrying away.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fairweather, Would you give a little further explanation.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: Sir, I made no statement whatsoever as to the railway fare. I took it for granted that the immigrant would pay his railway fare. I simply said that when you got him in this country and started to put him to work, that if you brought in substantial numbers you would have to build additional railroads to develop opportunities and you would have to have a certain amount of money to spend for additional railway facilities—that is, for the provision of better freight cars to haul the goods immigrants would be producing, and the additional rails and the natural resources to allow him to earn his living—and that the railways could not afford to spend more than \$150 per head an immigrant unless you were to assume that the railways were going to be worse off after the deal than they were before.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Mr. Fairweather, to carry that on a little farther: you would assume that the railways were going to operate at a loss.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I tried to put a limit to it. If you could do it and create an opportunity for \$50 a head then it would be profitable. There must be some limit. For instance, if you had to spend \$10,000 per capita to create an opportunity, then it would be perfectly evident that with the investments that there are in the railways to-day, you would have a pretty tough row to hoe, and what I said was that there is an upper limit to provide the opportunity.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: If a half million people were brought here this year you would not have to spend any money.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: It would surprise you that we would spend money.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: What would you spend it on?

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: The railways—

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: We have railways, and the railways have cars.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: We have a shortage of cars right now.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Why did you not order them earlier? You gave an order to the Canada Car only a few months ago?

The CHAIRMAN: If you do not mind, we will now hear from Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. M. W. MAXWELL: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, since my function is more particularly development any evidence I might offer to the Honourable Members of the Committee would be more logically concerned with the physical factors bearing on the placement of increased population and the absorption of added population into our industrial life.

There is no doubt that on a purely subsistence basis Canada could absorb several times its present population. The term "subsistence" implies securing from the land the minimum of return necessary to support physical existence without the amenities, material and cultural, that we have come to associate with our Canadian way of life and which we regard as establishing a proper background for Canadian citizenship.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: The word "subsistence" brings to mind the repeated reference in the various briefs to the standard of living in Canada. I am somewhat at a loss to know whether you mean that a person should be able to attend cocktail parties, whether that is necessary.

Mr. MAXWELL: We do not think so.



Hon. Mr. HORNER: What do you mean?

Mr. MAXWELL: We mean material and culture which we have come to associate with our Canadian way of life.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What is the better way of life?

Mr. MAXWELL: The Canadian way of life.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Who has a better life in Canada, the man who lives simply or the one who thinks he has to live high?

Mr. MAXWELL: We think his children should have schools.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: We hear so much along this line, that I get a little tired. If we are going to have immigration there will be some failures; but men will deprive themselves of certain things so that they may some day have a home and gather their own comforts around them. We believe that is to be gained in Canada; we do not believe that we should bring immigrants here in pullman cars and drawing rooms, but that eventually before their day is over they will take their share of that kind of life.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I rise to a point of order? We have one-half hour for this witness, and another witness is to follow whom if we do not hear this morning cannot attend our committee before it adjourns to make its report. May I ask my fellow members to allow the witness to read through his brief without interruption?

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, go ahead Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL:

Numerous estimates have been made of the capacity of Canada to absorb population ranging all the way from 25 millions to a lately-reported estimate of an ultimate capacity of 50 millions of people. Such estimates, it seems to me, can only visualize a land employment and a scale of land use and farm operation far below our present practice; they can only visualize the utilization of lands beyond the present limits of practical, economic transportation and the employment and development of lands of soil types presently regarded as marginal or inferior.

This question of marginal land might be discussed briefly in passing. What is marginal land and, as a corollary, what is submarginal land? I think marginal land might be described broadly as land which from its soil type or its location from a point of accessibility or the climatic conditions obtaining at its location or any combination of these factors renders it less amenable to development and hence less attractive to settlement than other lands substantially offering. Submarginal lands are those for which, in the present development of agricultural practice and technology, no substantial practical employment in agriculture can be visualized.

A very broad classification of soil types might be as follows:—

The Black Park Soils.

The Brown Park Soils.

First class grey wooded soils.

Second class grey wooded soils.

Third class grey wooded soils.

The Black and Brown Park Soils are characteristic of the most productive developed sections of the prairie provinces. Northward they merge into the grey wooded soils with which, with some variations, may be classified the soils of the St. Lawrence plain and the clay belt of northern Quebec and northern Ontario. The second class grey wooded soils are often spoken of as marginal, the third class as sub-marginal.

Care must be taken, however, to avoid the acceptance of broad classifications in assessing the potential of any area. The excellent soil classification work that is in progress across Canada can, from its nature only define the classes

of soils, technically, and from these qualities indicate its adaptation to agriculture. They would hardly presume to suggest values in place-utility that might place a poor soil in a certain situation in a higher economic category than the finest of soils less favourably located.

Thus market garden operations developed on patches of unpromising land in a locality of so small agricultural promise as to be eliminated from any organized scientific investigation or classification may, because of the existence of high market demand at that point be vastly more profitable than operations on the finest of park soils situated beyond the economic range of such markets. It might be suggested, too, that soils so light as to have failed of development or to have been abandoned because of their inability to support the type of crop formerly in demand in their location may have gained, as a result of advances in agricultural practice or of new demands for types of produce to which they may be well-adapted, a new utility and a high future agricultural potential. The City of New York draws a large part of its huge consumption of market garden produce from lands on Long Island and in the neighbouring State of New Jersey so light and sandy and so poor in their basic chemical constituents that they would be regarded as barrens in situations of less favourable market demand and a large part of the small fruits of the eastern seaboard are produced on lands no more naturally favoured.

It has seemed to some of us whose work is concerned with Canadian development subjects that land settlement, so far as it can be ordered or directed, should proceed as follows:—

1. Settlement of suitable available lands in areas now settled and accessible to present means of transportation, to markets, schools and the established social and cultural facilities, looking to the development of the highest possible Canadian citizenship.
2. Settlement of areas offering the best vacant lands in presently unsettled sections that are accessible or relatively accessible to present means of transportation and not too remote from present settlement.
3. Settlement of less accessible areas of suitable soils when pressure of demand for agricultural land may be more urgent.

While the above may be put forward as an expression of a broad settlement policy, new transportation projects with more than local development aims such as new rail or highway outlets from other established sections might open economic areas that may fall outside the above categories. In other words, cases may occur where the incidence of new transportation channels, providing thus locational advantages, may outweigh, in the settlement program, the advantage of prime soils and the social advantages of contiguous settlement.

For the immediately discernible future it seems to me that the closest attention should be given to opportunities for the settlement or re-settlement of areas in our first category above. In this I am mindful particularly of our future as a great industrial nation of the pressing need of expanding our exports through the conversion of our primary materials into finished manufactured goods. For this we need a population not only of a type and cultural background suited to industry but that they should be established in such locations that not only industrial opportunity offering but the means of developing their capacities and skills in an increasingly industrial Canadian atmosphere shall be opened to them.

As Mr. Fairweather has said, our primary and extractive industries have reached high levels of production through mechanization. Even higher levels of primary production are in sight pointing to further expansion in the availability of the materials of industry. The degree to which these can be converted,

through industrial processes for the markets of the world will be the measure not only of Canada's economic prosperity but the progress of our people in social security and in citizenship.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The suggestions numbered 1, 2 and 3 in Mr. Maxwell's memorandum are I think most constructive and the best of any I have heard; it is at least the ideal to keep in mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Maxwell; you have given a fine presentation.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The members of the committee will remember that the Steering Committee suggested that someone from the Department of the Secretary of State should be called to tell us what effort we were putting forward to bring the immigrants that we do receive and expect to receive into the Canadian way of life. Mr. Frank Foulds, the Director of the Citizenship Branch of that Department is here. I would now ask Mr. Foulds to come forward.

Mr. FRANK FOULDS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we attempted to boil down this brief to a few pages, and took the liberty of putting on the front a summary of the points which we wish to discuss to-day. If you will allow me first to read the summary and the remainder of the brief, then we can enlarge on the various points.

This is the brief submitted by me as Director of the Canadian Citizenship Branch, of the Department of the Secretary of State:—

#### CANADIAN IMMIGRANT TRAINING SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. What makes a good Canadian is not race, creed or national origin but skill, loyalty and determination to be one.

2. Adjustment to Canadian life and economy on the part of the immigrant is a matter of training involving:—

(a) Knowledge of language.

(b) Appreciation of Canadian democratic traditions.

(c) Acceptance of full responsibility as a citizen in the local community.

3. Plans are already being formulated under the Canadian Citizenship Act to provide training for all applicants for Canadian citizenship in every geographical area. This will involve:—

(a) Language courses in English or French.

(b) Courses of instruction in Canadian history, geography, elementary business practice, and the forms and functions of government.

We put there "elementary business practice" rather than "Canadian economics."

In addition plans are already being implemented through churches, service clubs, and local citizens' committees to ensure the acceptance of the new citizens into the social life of the local community.

4. These plans could only apply to the immigrant after one year of residence in Canada. That is the period which must elapse before he can make a Declaration of Intention to become a Canadian citizen. But an immigrant is not required at any time to qualify for Canadian citizenship, or to undertake any form of training, I am speaking in that section of the legal requirements.

5. These plans could be extended to all immigrants and the desirable objectives of adjustment to Canadian life more rapidly attained.

6. Recommendations for such an extension are made at the conclusion of the brief.



## CANADIAN IMMIGRANT TRAINING

## PREAMBLE

Government policy is to increase population by immigration to the point where Canada can develop her economic resources to the full. It is the assumption, therefore, that the immigrant is being admitted to Canada for permanent domicile. On his admission, the major social problem is to make him Canadian. Successful immigration depends, therefore, not merely on careful selection but on adequate training, with consequent adjustment to the Canadian way of life.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

To provide training for the immigrant that will enable him as rapidly as possible—

- (a) to achieve his maximum usefulness to the Canadian economy.
- (b) to adjust himself to and accept fully the Canadian way of life.

## EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM

The immigrant's first and most pressing need for both (a) and (b) above is that of language. Without some basic skill in either English or French he cannot follow the most elementary instructions given him. For example, even in the simplest farm work, the economic usefulness of many of the Polish veterans recently arrived has been greatly limited because they had no means of knowing what was expected of them. If he is to learn how to do his job in the Canadian way, he must learn to speak and think as a Canadian. Furthermore, knowing neither English nor French confines the immigrant only to those ideas and loyalties expressed in his native tongue.

The adjustment of the immigrant during the first year in Canada both as to language, economic usefulness and social life is critical. During this period he develops both the skills and attitudes which more often than not determine his basic loyalties and future usefulness as a Canadian citizen.

## SUGGESTED SOLUTION

*Citizenship Training—General*

1. Under the Canadian Citizenship Act it takes at least five years of Canadian domicile to become a Canadian citizen. The immigrant may file his declaration of intention to become a Canadian citizen at the end of his first year of residence in this country.

2. At the time when the immigrant files his declaration of intention with the District or County Court he is to be presented with a manual "How to become a Canadian citizen." This manual explains the technical and legal steps necessary to become a Canadian citizen, some of the more salient points of Canadian history, geography and forms of government. Copies should be ready for distribution not later than the 1st of July of this year. I have the printers' proof here this morning.

3. Under the British North America Act, while qualification for citizenship is definitely a federal matter, education is that of the provinces. Judges from coast to coast have submitted opinions as to the desirable minimum common standard of qualification for citizenship they are prepared to accept. But the only way in which adequate instruction can be made available to meet those qualifications depends upon the facilities which the provincial departments of education provide.

*Plan of Operation*

4. After a conference with representatives of Ministers of Education of the provinces, called at the beginning of May, the following general plan was agreed upon in principle:—



- (a) The Department of Education will wherever possible set up instructional facilities covering their geographic area. The more remote areas may have to be served by some Departments of Education through correspondence courses supplemented by travelling teachers.
- (b) As instructional facilities are set up throughout the provincial area the provincial department of education would inform each District or County Court as to what instruction in citizenship is available.
- (c) At the time of his declaration of intention the applicant will be told by the Clerk of the Court what citizenship training is available to him. He will also be told what standards the Judge will require him to meet before Canadian citizenship is granted to him.

5. It is hoped that in most cases such training will be undertaken by the applicant. In the minds of some members of the judiciary refusal to take advantage of available training for citizenship would be evidence of an unwillingness to assume its responsibilities.

#### *Citizenship Training—Language*

6. Many of the Judges thought that to qualify, an applicant should be reasonably well informed on current and public questions. It is impossible to be so informed if the sources of information do not include Canadian newspapers, radio or even the discussions of fellow Canadians. The applicant would then be confined only to those ideas expressed in his native tongue.

7. Skill in language should therefore be sufficient to read simple Canadian newspaper reports. This is the standard that many of the Courts would like to see placed on the qualification "that he has an adequate knowledge of English or French." This is approximately that amount of reading and speaking skill expected at the end of Grade III in an ordinary school. The conference of the Deputy Ministers of Education decided that a minimum uniform curriculum could achieve this language standard within approximately one year of instruction.

#### *Citizenship Training—Forms and Function of Government*

8. Another important qualification for Canadian citizenship is that the applicant should possess an adequate knowledge of its privileges and responsibilities. This is a difficult qualification to judge. But the basis for such a knowledge should be at least an elementary acquaintance with the way we have grown to be a nation—our history and our political tradition.

9. The Deputy Ministers of Education felt this citizenship training should also be common and standard across Canada. They decided that such a common course of study would have to meet the needs and interests of the adult immigrant. To design such a course is the work for experienced professional educators. Since the Canadian Educational Association represents all the Provincial Departments of Education as well as the professional educators of Canada, the task of drawing up such a course was referred to this association for recommendation.

10. Such a curriculum would include Canadian history, geography and economics, as well as the function and forms of Canadian government (federal, provincial and municipal). The applicant should not only know the measure in which he may in Canada enjoy freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and equality before the law. It is equally important that he appreciate the democratic tradition out of which these freedoms have grown, at what cost they were won, and how jealously they are to be guarded.

11. He should know the contributions which various national groups have made to the cultural and constitutional life of Canada. He should also know the basic organization of our government and that our way of correcting abuses and apparent injustices is by rational discussion and majority vote. Such

instruction would include the history of responsible government, explain what voting is and how one goes about it, and stress the fact that the secret ballot has been and must remain our tried means of democratic progress and constitutional change.

12. We hope to prepare the applicant between the time he declares his intention of becoming a Canadian citizen and the final examination for qualification, both in language and appreciation of Canadian government. In addition to this we are arranging through contact with community organizations, clubs and churches to make the newcomer feel that he belongs to the Canadian family.

13. This sense of equality of status in the community,—this sense of belonging,—is essentially a social matter. No amount of government regulation can deal with it. A court can make a man legally a citizen. A night school may provide him with skill in language and a knowledge of our democratic way of life. But only as he can feel himself to be a real and accepted member of a local Canadian community will his first loyalty be to Canada rather than to any other nation or tradition.

#### *The First Year—A Possible Solution*

14. But the above solution is one of long-range. It does not assist at all in meeting now the initial problems of either the immigrant or his employer. For there is at present no regulation which requires an immigrant to undertake any training, and no adequate facilities are established for him if he were so required,—I mean on as comprehensive a scale as we will need.

15. When the first group of Polish veterans arrived in this country the Canadian Citizenship Branch translated Part II of the manual "How to become a Canadian Citizen" into Polish and distributed it to them. In co-operation with the Department of Labour one of the Polish speaking officers of the Branch was detailed to act as a counsellor and guide to these veterans who were settled on farms in the Ottawa area. His job was to assist them and their employers in adjusting themselves to each other both as to language, and getting the required farm jobs done. The largest group of Polish veterans were settled in the Ottawa district. Though these immigrants and their employers faced as many difficulties as those in other areas the adjustment here has been more satisfactory than in any other area of Canada. Problems were met as they arose and adjustments were made before serious trouble could grow out of them. Some of them actually proved humorous. They were so small, yet if this had not been dealt with, argument, dissatisfaction, and wild statements would have followed.

16. If similar counselling by Citizenship Officers with approximate language qualifications could be made available many of the practical dangers of the initial period could be avoided.

In addition if what is now proposed in language training for applicants for citizenship could be extended so that the immigrant starts learning English or French the moment he arrives in Canada, we would be well on the way to making a useful Canadian. At that time he is keen to comply. Later on he finds that he can get along with "pidgin" English or poor French, and has not the same urge at all to take training.

17. If we want immigrants to become efficient workmen and good citizens it is apparent that some such program of training is essential. Not to do so could retard our industrial efficiency, lower our social standards and radically change our Canadian way of life. The way in which subversive movements

use disaffected national groups for their own ends makes the need for Canadian immigrant training imperative, if many of the difficulties associated with immigration are to be avoided.

RECOMMENDATIONS: These are looking to the future, rather than recommendations of what could be put into effect this month.

It is therefore recommended that—

1. (a) both immigrant and prospective employer and/or sponsor give undertakings to ensure that the immigrant will begin language training as soon as he arrives in Canada.
- (b) that the Departments of the Secretary of State, and Labour, in co-operation with the employer and/or sponsor ensure that adequate facilities for this training is available on the immigrant's arrival in the area.
2. That citizenship counsellors with language qualifications be detailed to assist the immigrant and his employer during the initial critical period of adjustment to his job and Canadian life, i.e., during the first year after his date of entry.
3. That each immigrant accepted for permanent domicile in Canada be informed before leaving Europe—
  - (a) that he will be expected to declare his intention to qualify for Canadian citizenship within two years after his date of arrival in Canada.
  - (b) that, if after two years of Canadian domicile, he is unwilling so to begin qualification for Canadian citizenship his permit for permanent domicile in Canada will become automatically invalid.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Foulds, what are the practical steps towards bringing this about? In the recommendations you say that he should begin his language training so soon as he arrives in Canada. How can we bring that about? Can we have classes established say in Montreal when the boat arrives, or what?

Mr. FOULDS: The immigrants who come out to their relatives here will naturally go as individuals into small groups. We have an arrangement with the Immigration Department that they advise us of the lists of people who come on each of the ships. We break those down at their destination and try to pass on the information to local, either educational or community bodies, which will try to get in touch with these people and, if there is a small group of them, get them together for language training. That has been done quite successfully with these Polish veterans. Where pulp and paper mills or textiles mills or other agencies, in some cases agricultural, bring out a group of people, we at once contact these people or these firms to see if they will work with us to provide facilities where night classes can be had, where, say, bunk house arrangements can be made whereby they are kept together so that they can attend night classes, and then the departments of education take charge of the servicing.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I think that is very, very important. Perhaps you would agree that but for our failure to put in practice a number of these recommendations we might not have lost five hundred of these Yugoslavs. I believe there should be a permanent staff to take charge of this work on a non-political basis. In the United States, before an immigrant can hold a job of any importance or secure such employment, he must apply for citizenship papers, while in Canada we have people who have been here twenty years and are holding down very important positions, but no attention is paid nor is any preference given to the man who is a Canadian citizen. That is a circumstance which has bothered judges in western Canada; applications would be made by people who have been here thirty years and perhaps do not know who the



Prime Minister is. At election times the various parties are interested in rustling around to get the votes of these people, and it is not morally a very uplifting experience for these people to have their applications rushed through at election time, the only time when any attention is paid to them.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Can they vote if they are not Canadian citizens?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: They do, though.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: They do sometimes, because of smooth work on the part of a politician, but I do think this work is valuable, and there ought to be a proper staff to cover the whole country. I believe it is very important and would be of great value.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It would not need to be a very large staff, would it Mr. Foulds?

Mr. FOULDS: No, sir. If you handle the big centres—Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, a few others—that is all you would have to do.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I cannot imagine a greater service that would be rendered the country, as well as the people who come here, than would be done by a staff of that kind.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: How long had these Yugoslavs been in the country who have recently gone out?

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I see by the press that some have been here twenty years, but I do not know how many. I notice that some few have citizenship papers. Many have been here quite a number of years and have been allowed to stay here without any training of the kind referred to this morning.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Mr. Foulds' immediate section has been newly established, of course. It is a step in the right direction.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Oh, yes. It is a very fine thing.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course we must not depreciate what has been done. Our own new Canadians have furnished schools very extensively where they have taught their own people how to speak the English language and trained them in Canadian citizenship and inspired them with the greatness of our country and the desirability of being Canadians—given them the national self respect which is required if men are to love their country.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: But we have suffered very much from this hyphenated Canadianism. Mr. Cameron felt strongly on that point; he had so much to do with it. He said in most cases their difficulties came with the second generation of Canadians, who went to our schools but were not accepted on a level with the other children by the children themselves, and they had got away from their parents, and were not full Canadians.

Mr. FOULDS: If I might comment on Senator Roebuck's statement: I think the unfortunate fact is that these ethnic groups, if I can call them that, has done a very excellent job, in giving this training, but we, Canadian born and accepted Canadian people, take it so much for granted that we are Canadians that we have not inspired this Yugoslav group, for example, with the feeling that we regard it as really important to be a Canadian.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it not so, that many of them were never made to feel at home in Canada?

Mr. FOULDS: Yes, we need to supplement the excellent work done by the ethnic groups.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: I think properly chosen people, exclusive of Canadians, would go a great deal further to making people welcome here, and they would pay greater attention to it. It would prove of greater value than leaving it to the particular groups themselves.



Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, but these groups always welcome a Canadian. I say that from real experience. I know that the groups would be much impressed if an official of the Canadian Government Citizenship Branch called on them, watched them work, and expressed their appreciation of what they were doing and give some guidance. It would be a grand work; real patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything further?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: If there is anything we can do, Mr. Foulds, to help your position we shall be glad to do it.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Perhaps Colonel Krug is better acquainted with what I am about to say, but the other night we had speak to us a Polish immigrant who had just received his citizenship. I think everybody was very much impressed in what he said. He spoke for the group who were given the certificate by the I.O.D.E. that night. He said, "We have come to this country. We are very proud to be Canadian citizens and very grateful for the reception you have given us. My ancestors did not help to make your roads or build your railways or develop your industries, but you must remember that we did this work in our own country and we want to make our contribution here; but we do not wish to be second-class citizens." He expressed himself admirably.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Colonel C. A. Krug is here. He is the assistant to Mr. Foulds, the Assistant Director of Citizenship. Perhaps he would like to say something.

Mr. KRUG: I do not know, sir, that I have anything more to contribute in the brief that Mr. Foulds submitted. I was here to more or less support him if any particular questions might have arisen. I do think that there is one point that might be well emphasized in connection with this recent movement abroad to Yugoslavia. There is no question that a very large proportion of the technical workers have been confined to their own newspapers and their own ideas about Canada, and their opportunities in Canada in contrast to what they are going to is very largely determined by what they have read in their newspapers. That is, you narrow your immigrant in that way. If the immigrant coming out now—wherever he may come from—can rapidly as possible acquire the language that enables him to get along in business and enable him to read our own newspapers and bulletins, and so on, it would be impossible for any group outside the country or inside the country to utilize our national groups for anything else but for a Canadian purpose. I think that that is extremely important. Of course, the facilities that now exist in the various provinces for trades training and agricultural training become immediately available to the immigrant once he gets the basic skill and a basic understanding of English. He can then converse with the different members of the Department of Agriculture and can utilize the vocational training that is very often necessary if he is a technical worker so that he can, for instance, change over from the use of a lathe to our way of using them as different from the European manner, and he will be better equipped to go into the technical industries in Oshawa, Windsor or some place like that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You are laying emphasis on the necessity of teaching him basic English.

Mr. KRUG: Yes, particularly in the early period. Once he has mastered a basic knowledge of the English language there are many courses open to him—courses in citizenship and in adult education and trades training. If this is reinforced by the immigrant being socially accepted by the community; that is to say, his wife being invited by the Ladies' Aid to join their society, and so on, and if the immigrant can get along recreationally by learning to play football and hockey, I am sure there would not be the big break between the European and the Canadian.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Do you think that the colony system of settlement in Canada that was in use in the past has been a handicap to the development of new Canadians?

Mr. KRUG: I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think it is quite unlikely ever again that will be possible, since the colonies were based very largely on the availability of large tracts of land.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I think we should discourage it in the future.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, but do not go too far. In the cities you have groups of these nationalities who have brought something to Canada and have made a contribution to this country. I do not think we should even express the desire that they forget their land of origin any more than we should forget ours. I think they should keep their culture. I also think it is very wise for them to keep their language because of the fact that two languages are good, no matter what the second language may be. We should not try to discourage them, for instance, from forgetting their Ukrainian national dances. That would be silly on our part.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Well, we should not go too far in what you are saying about the groups in cities, Senator Roebuck. In the cities it seems to me that every effort should be made to allow these people to mingle and mix with native Canadians and not be segregated into groups so that in the cities there would not be a "Little Ukraine" or a little this or that. These groups should be encouraged to intermingle with the rest of the population. I think that is very essential.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is no question about that, but I cannot get over the fact that these people have brought something to this country with them.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: No, we do not want to lose that if we can help it.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to the gentlemen who have appeared before us. We have some valuable information now for the records.

The committee adjourned until tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.









1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

## Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 10

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

- Mr. William M. Teresio, President, Association of United Ukrainian Canadians.
- Miss Constance Hayward, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian National Committee on Refugees.
- Mr. B. K. Sandwell, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C., Toronto, Ontario, Honorary Chairman, Canadian National Committee on Refugees.
- Mr. George A. Wenige, Mayor of the city of London, Ontario.
- Mr. Stanley Lewis, O.B.E., LL.D., Mayor of the city of Ottawa, Ontario.
- Mr. James Colley, Resident Representative of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

### APPENDIX

"A" Record of the number of displaced persons and refugees in Germany and Austria as of March, 1947, and record of displaced persons receiving UNRRA assistance, classified by occupation and sex.

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Pb.

PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

---

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, 5th June, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators Murdock, Chairman; Buchanan, Burhill, Campbell, Crerar, Dupuis, Hushion, McDonald (*Shediac*), Robinson, Roebuck, Taylor, Veniot and Wilson—13.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Chairman read into the record a letter directed to him by Mr. Eric W. Morse, National Secretary, United Nations Society in Canada, containing a Resolution of the Society on Immigration of Displaced Persons.

Mr. William M. Teresio, President, Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, appeared and read a brief on Immigration on behalf of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, the Ukrainian Labor-Farmer Temple Association, the Workers' Benevolent Association and the Newspaper *Ukrainian Life*, and was questioned.

Miss Constance Hayward, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian National Committee on Refugees, was heard on the activities of the Canadian National Committee on Refugees and gave an outline of her recent visit to the refugee camps of Europe. Miss Hayward also outlined the type of immigration available for immigration to Canada and the activities of other countries to secure immigrants from the refugee camps of Europe. Miss Hayward filed a record of the number of displaced persons and refugees in Germany and Austria as of March, 1947, and a record of displaced persons receiving UNRRA assistance, classified by occupation and sex. (See appendix "A").

Mr. B. K. Sandwell, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C., Toronto, Ontario, Honorary Chairman, Canadian National Committee on Refugees, was heard with respect to the problem of displaced persons of Europe and advocated that displaced persons of Europe be admitted to Canada without delay.

Mr. George A. Wenige, Mayor of the city of London, Ontario, was heard and presented a Resolution passed by the London, Ontario, City Council, on Immigration to Canada, and was questioned. Mr. Wenige undertook to furnish for the information of the Committee confirmation of the concurrence in the Resolution by other municipalities of Canada.

Mr. Stanley Lewis, O.B.E., LL.D., Mayor of the city of Ottawa, Ontario, appeared and presented a brief on Immigration on behalf of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, and was questioned.

Mr. James Colley, Resident Representative of the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees, again appeared and answered questions by Members of the Committee with respect to displaced persons of Europe available for immigration to Canada.

At 12.50 p.m., the Committee adjourned until Thursday, 12th June, instant, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE

THURSDAY, June 5, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, first I shall read a letter that was addressed to me and signed by Eric W. Morse of the United Nations Society in Canada. The letter was addressed to me as Chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Labour. The letter reads as follows:—

## UNITED NATIONS SOCIETY IN CANADA

NATIONAL OFFICE

OTTAWA

B. K. Sandwell,  
1st Vice-Pres. and Chm. Nat. Exec.

Dr. James S. Thomson,  
National President.

G. E. Beament,  
Hon. Treasurer.

Eric W. Morse,  
National Secretary.

The Hon. JAMES MURDOCK, P.C.,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on  
Immigration and Labour,

The Senate, Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—I am directed to convey to you the following resolution, which was unanimously passed at the Annual Meeting of the United Nations Society held at London, Ontario, May 17:—

That the Annual Meeting of the United Nations Society in Canada notes with approval the Government's action in broadening the scope of regulations governing the Immigration of Displaced Persons and urges that the Government, while having due regard to employment needs of the country, extend those regulations to admit our fair share of Displaced Persons.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgnd) ERIC W. MORSE,  
*National Secretary.*

We shall now hear from William M. Teresio, President, Association of United Ukrainian Canadians.

Mr. TERESIO: Honourable senators, I know that your time is well taken up this morning, and we shall try to be as brief as possible. I do not propose to introduce you to the whole delegation. Their names appear on the brief and I am sure all honourable senators have briefs before them.

The CHAIRMAN: The briefs will be included in the stenographic record.



Mr. TERESIO: On May 29, 1946, our delegation appeared before your Committee and presented a brief on the subject of immigration into Canada. In this our second appearance we wish to reiterate our support to a policy of broad immigration into Canada as beneficial to the interests and future welfare of our country and our position that such an immigration policy should exclude discrimination because of national origin or religious belief, particularly as it affects immigration of people of Ukrainian nationality.

In reviewing the achievements of your Committee during the past year, we are gratified to see that it has resulted in the broadening of immigration regulations to permit entry into Canada of classes of relatives of Canadian residents previously barred, and the establishment of immigration offices in a number of countries.

We wholeheartedly concur with the recommendations of your Committee as published in the official report of the Debates of the Senate (March 11, 1947) and urge the quickest implementation of sub-sections (c) and (d) of Section 3.

(c) that surveys be undertaken immediately in Europe to determine the localities where immigrants may be found, and the conditions and anticipated problems to be met.

(d) that a survey be undertaken in Canada in order to determine the agricultural and industrial resources available for use by prospective immigrants, and the conditions and anticipated problems to be met.

Such comprehensive surveys, in our opinion, are the precondition for a consistent long-range immigration program for Canada, entirely apart from the temporary and narrower problems of permitting entry to relatives of Canadian residents and to bona fide "displaced persons" into Canada.

We are aware that the depletion of population during the war, the manpower shortage in the gigantic task of postwar reconstruction, the land reforms and programs for industrial development will seriously limit the source of immigration in some European countries which in the past have served as a reservoir of surplus population. Nevertheless, a careful study of the situation in this regard in all countries and measures to provide proper inducement and assistance to would-be immigrants should overcome the difficulties that stand in the way of satisfactory immigration from Europe. It seems to us that the Scandinavian countries and those of Western Europe offer the greatest promise in this regard in the immediate future.

In carrying out Section 3, subsection (d) of your Committee's recommendations, we propose that it be interpreted to include not only a survey of agricultural and industrial resources already under exploitation, but also the possibilities of opening new areas to cultivation and the initiation of new industries in Canada. The simple "dumping" of new farmers on areas already being cultivated or new workers in industries already staffed would neither offer the necessary inducement to immigrants nor to any extent increase our productive power, while it could have an unfavourable reaction on Canada.

We protest against the permission granted by order in council to groups and individuals to bring over contingents of workers from Europe on the basis of private "surveys" and selection and under conditions which smack of "indentured" labour and constitute a threat to employment and labour relations in our country.

We note with concern that no policy has hitherto been formulated for the initial planning and subsidizing of immigration. We would point out that such countries as Argentina and Mexico have secured considerable immigrants by organizing and financing land settlement schemes in definite areas in their countries. The original impetus to European immigration into Canada was also the existence of free land as homesteads and appropriate measures to launch

settlement on these lands. In Canada to-day there are tracts of arable land, in the north and even in the older settled districts, where a similar policy could and should be adopted.

We are of the opinion that, until the surveys recommended by your Commission and comprehensive measures of assistance to newcomers are undertaken by the government, Canada will continue to lack a positive and constructive policy for broad immigration.

During the past year there has grown a tendency in Canada to avoid facing the above fundamental problems in the working out of a genuine immigration policy and substitute therefor policies directly opposed to the successful solution of that issue.

Thus, instead of adhering to the fundamental policy of bringing in people of the labouring and farming classes, we now hear more and more about opening the gates to people of the professional and middle classes.

We submit that Canada's need for immigration arises from the need to enlarge our industrial and agricultural production, thus increasing our national income and the purchasing power of the Canadian people. This means that the basis of our immigration policy must be, (1) to bring in workers and farmers; and (2) to create conditions in Canada where they could engage in expanding industry and agriculture.

We believe that a proper survey would show that the need and possibility of placing professional classes in Canada is limited (and further complicated by the differences in language and educational standards of the people whom it is proposed to receive into Canada, making it necessary for lengthy re-education), and that under no circumstances should immigration from this source be permitted to substitute for the basic problem of worker and farmer immigration. This point was raised regarding doctors in Europe at the Health Committee of the Manitoba Legislature. It was agreed that professionals, graduating after Hitler came to power, have been trained and educated in Fascist ideology.

Similarly, under the phrase "selective immigration" there has grown a tendency to propose substitution of immigration of people of a particular religious or political background for a policy of broad immigration based on Canada's needs and perspectives.

We submit that this type of "selective immigration" is contrary to Canada's democratic traditions and in so far as it serves as a mask to cover the bringing over to Canada of the pro-Nazi remnants in Europe it is subversive and fraught with dangers to Canadian democracy and security.

If we are to adopt a policy of "selective immigration" on the basis of political record, then we suggest that in justice to the Canadians who sacrificed and died in the war the only acceptable immigrants should be those who fought against Nazi Germany and her satellites during the war and not those who fought with her against us and our allies.

Finally, there is the glaring preoccupation with the so-called "displaced persons" in Europe as a substitute for a genuine broad immigration policy.

In this regard we submit the following views:—

- (1) Apart from the Jewish and Spanish anti-Fascist refugees the so-called displaced persons in and outside D.P. camps in Germany, Austria and Italy are either war criminals and Nazi collaborators who are wanted by the governments of their countries to stand trial or persons free to return to their homelands.
- (2) There is a long-standing decision of the Allied powers, further elaborated at the recent foreign ministers' conference in Moscow, to resolve this problem by handing war criminals over to their respective governments and repatriating the others to their homelands.

We are opposed to any policy which would make Canada a haven for war criminals or pro-Nazi politicians under the guise of "immigration".

We protest against the activities of certain agencies in Canada, which have been working to prevent the above proper solution of the so-called "displaced persons" issue by false propaganda both among the Canadian people and the "displaced persons" themselves. These activities were so scandalous that the British occupation authorities were compelled to ban entry of a number of Ukrainian-language newspapers (*Novy Shlyah and others*) into their zone in Germany in June of last year. In April of this year the Allied control council in Germany decided to disband all "Committee centres" and similar organizations operating against the interests of Allied powers among "displaced persons"; we would point out that many of these "centres" were organized from Canada and that the activities barred in Germany are still continuing from Canadian soil.

We urge that Canada's immigration policy be founded on the basis on which it was intended: the broadest recruitment of immigrants from the labouring and farming classes without prejudice or discrimination because of religion, creed or nationality, with government financing and assistance to place them where they would expand our industrial and agricultural production and contribute to the further building-up of Canada.

We thank you for your kind invitation to present our views.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question? We had before us yesterday Mr. Frank Foulds, Director of the Canadian Citizenship Branch, whose information to the committee you will be able to read in the printed record shortly. Among other things he stressed the fact that the department was going to undertake to educate those foreign gentlemen who come to Canada, in either French or English language, and also to undertake to ascertain if they are going to declare an intention within one year of becoming Canadian citizens. What would be the thought of you and your association on that point?

Mr. TERESIO: I certainly would have no objection; I feel it is the duty and obligation of those who come to Canada to study the Canadian language if they become Canadian citizens.

The CHAIRMAN: That is either one or both of the Canadian languages.

Mr. TERESIO: Yes, either one or both.

The CHAIRMAN: What about declaring their intention to become Canadian citizens within one year of their arrival?

Mr. TERESIO: Of course, that is a question. It depends on who the persons are.

The CHAIRMAN: These people in your committee and those to whom you referred are Canadian citizens or have elected to become such?

Mr. TERESIO: They are all Canadian citizens; in fact most of them were born in Canada. I do not think there is one who was not born in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: And they all speak the English or French language?

Mr. TERESIO: They all speak English.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Have you any objection to any step that the government, or any private organization, might take to bring about Canadian citizenship among immigrants arriving in this country, and making them real Canadians?

Mr. TERESIO: We certainly have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think it would be the consistent thing to do?

Mr. TERESIO: Yes. It all depends on whom the immigrants are.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Tell us an immigrant that should not become a Canadian.



Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I do not think we should have any immigrants come into this country who are not going to assume that obligation.

Mr. TERESIO: That is right.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What had you in mind when you made the exception? You said it depends on the person. What person may come here as an immigrant intending to stay in Canada who does not propose to become a Canadian citizen?

Mr. TERESIO: If a person comes to Canada to be a Canadian and to stay in Canada, he should certainly become a Canadian citizen.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Without any exception?

Mr. TERESIO: Without any exception. There are people coming into Canada who are not becoming Canadians, and we should not—

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: They should not come in at all.

Mr. TERESIO: They should not come in.

The CHAIRMAN: In your brief you say this: "We urge that Canada's immigration policy be founded on the basis on which it was intended: the broadcast recruitment of immigrants from the labouring and farming classes without prejudice or discrimination because of religion, creed or nationality. . . ." I understood you to suggest in the foregoing part of your brief that there were some who should not be brought here. Will you explain your point? There are some among the displaced persons in Germany who should not come to Canada. Will you tell us why?

Mr. TERESIO: In our brief we mention that anybody who collaborated with Hitler certainly should not be let into Canada; any party guilty of war crimes certainly should not come in. Hundreds of persons were taken into Germany by force and are now in the Displaced Persons camp, but that is a different question. We do not care about religion or nationality, but if a person has been guilty of war crimes and is wanted by some European government—

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: They will do something to him over in Europe, and he will not be allowed to come here.

Mr. TERESIO: If those persons are dealt with over there the problem is solved.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: You do not suggest that we should not accept German immigrants?

Mr. TERESIO: No, I do not mean that. I refer to those people who are guilty of war crimes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Do you place the Polish veterans in this category you are now speaking of?

Mr. TERESIO: If they have any guilt, sir. I am not here to say whether they are guilty or not, but there are some people who are guilty. I presume they do not come here. If any Polish soldiers have any war crime guilt they should not be here. I presume those who are here were examined by the committee and no guilty ones got in.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course we do not allow anybody to come in who has any crime record against him, no matter what his nationality, religion or race may be. We keep them all out.

Mr. TERESIO: I hope so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: At least we try to keep them out.

Mr. CAMPBELL: On page 4 you use these words: "We submit that this type of 'selective immigration' is contrary to Canada's democratic traditions and in so far as it serves as a mask to cover the bringing over to Canada of the



pro-Nazi remnants in Europe it is subversive and fraught with dangers to Canadian democracy and security." What do you mean by that paragraph?

Mr. TERESIO: Well, there may be some selections made and certain individuals may pretend to be agricultural workers or may pretend to be professional people, and may not be so. We feel that the government should be the proper body to conduct the general policy and select those people who are really free of all pro-Nazi ideology.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Your term "selective immigration" applies to selection by individuals within the country. I read that paragraph as meaning that you were opposed to selective immigration by the government.

Mr. TERESIO: Selection by groups.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions to be asked this gentleman may we proceed with our rather lengthy docket? We are much obliged to you, Mr. Teresio and to your associates. Will you look at the record of yesterday's proceedings and take note of what Mr. Foulds said to our committee.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We should like you to co-operate in bringing about real Canadians of the immigrants who do arrive.

Mr. TERESIO: Honourable senators, on behalf of the committee I wish to thank you sincerely and assure you that most of our delegates here are Canadians. We have with us Mr. Philipowich who was a paratrooper, and Mr. Bilecki who also was in the armed forces. The gentlemen here are Canadians, and our aim is to make Ukrainians Canadians. I assure you that when we get your report we will try to be of assistance.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: As Chairman of the Canadian National Committee on Refugees it is my privilege to introduce Mr. B. K. Sandwell, though it seems rather unnecessary to do so, who is our honorary chairman. May I say that Mr. Sandwell is honorary chairman in name only, because we are able to call upon him for his services at any time they are needed. I wish also to introduce Miss Constance Hayward, who has recently returned from a tour of the displaced persons camp in Germany and Austria, at the invitation of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. She is, therefore, able to speak with some knowledge acquired during her trip and also over a period of many years during which she has been closely in touch with all these people, and knows of their availability, suitability and needs, as well as the moral issue involved.

Senator Turgeon, who represented Canada on several international commissions, promised to be here, but as you will remember he stressed in the Senate that Canada had accepted an obligation when she said that none of these people should be returned to their homelands against their will.

I now call on Miss Hayward.

Miss CONSTANCE HAYWARD: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, I am glad to have the opportunity of adding something of what I said on behalf of our committee last year, not because there is any change in our thesis—it stands the same—but I have had impressed upon me very emphatically in the last few months the need and urgency of our action in taking displaced persons.

Perhaps I should say first the areas which I visited. I went first to the British zone in Germany, and from Hanover motored to camps in that area.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Would you mind putting on the record who is your committee? Perhaps some here do not quite understand. You are the Canadian National Committee on Refugees?

Miss HAYWARD: The Secretary of the Canadian National Committee on Refugees. That is a private and voluntary organization which was set up in 1938 to assist refugees, and that "assistance" we took to mean both assistance to individuals and provision of information to the public on the refugee problem. That, I think, explains why I went to Germany this last winter. It was desired to

have first-hand information on the people, their capabilities and the conditions under which they are living, and a picture of the whole general refugee problem.

As I started to say, I visited British zones of Germany, visiting camps from Hanover, the American zone, motoring out from Frankfurt, and from Munich, and then I went to Vienna, from where I saw camps in the British zones and Austria, and stopped in Innsbruck to see camps in the French zones of Austria. I should like to stop for a moment and say that I was urged by the refugee workers to go to Austria. There are fewer refugees there than in Germany, but as individuals their problems and their desires to resettle are just as real and just as strong as those in Germany. More than that, they feel themselves to be in a much more uncertain—I think they feel it to be a precarious—situation. You see, as long as there are occupation forces in a country or a zone, the displaced persons feel that they have some protection and support. It is obvious that the occupation forces will withdraw from Austria before they do from Germany. There was a possibility that a treaty might be signed; at least in the winter there was a discussion of the possibility of a treaty soon. Now, the displaced persons feel that, if the occupation forces withdraw, the new independent government of Austria may not be strong enough to resist a feared pressure for repatriation, and, of course, the great fear of a great many of the displaced persons is that they may be forcibly repatriated. How serious that situation is I cannot say. I do know that the uneasiness of the displaced persons caused by it is serious, serious enough to worry them and to concern the people who are working for their welfare.

I have figures which were given to me by the intergovernmental committee on refugees, as to the total number of displaced persons in Germany and Austria—and I have taken them from a more detailed list of figures which includes Italy. I did not visit Italy, and I do not propose to discuss that at all; but I must mention that there are, or were in March this year, 146,000 displaced persons in Italy, so that even if a small number of this total should be repatriated before the end of this month I do not think it is any exaggeration or any mistake to think of the displaced persons in terms of one million non-repatriable people.

The classification is by nationalities, and that is given for the sake of information. We in the refugee committee are not concerned with these people because one of them was born in Poland and another was born in Yugoslavia. We are concerned because they are homeless individuals, because they are the people who came from concentration camps and slave labour, that is, they are anti-Nazis, and because they are non-repatriable, and because they do not wish or feel that they can return to countries that are controlled by communist governments. That, I think suggests their acceptability or compatibility as citizens for a democratic country. We are interested in them on that basis. We are interested in them too, I think, on their qualifications as immigrants, as citizens of Canada. And before I discuss their capabilities in occupations I must say that I think that political compatibility is not the least important of their qualifications.

Now, on the subject of their occupational abilities. I was told that the UNRRA reports estimate that two-thirds of this group of a million displaced persons are employable. I want to explain that this does not mean that one-third are all aged and infirm and incapacitated, because in the employable group they do not count any person under sixteen or the mothers of children up to six. Now, when these people have been deducted from the third, I think it is not very different from a normal community, with its workers and dependents.

The CHAIRMAN: Are mothers and children enumerated here on this?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes; all the persons are listed there. But in my estimate that two-thirds of these people are employable, the mothers of children under six and persons under sixteen are not counted. I should think that that comes pretty near the make-up of a normal community.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse my lack of understanding: what are "Balts"?

Miss HAYWARD: The Balts are the people from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. As a matter of fact, I think that that term is not quite correct. They are the Baltic people. The true Balts are another group.

The CHAIRMAN: But they are from these three small countries?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes. Now, I have brought also an occupational analysis prepared by UNRRA as of last summer, and while the figures may be slightly smaller in a few categories, I think that the number of people who have been evacuated from the camps in the last year is not so great as to make an appreciable difference in the consideration of this occupational analysis.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What do you mean there by "stateless"?

Miss HAYWARD: The stateless people are people who have no longer nationality. I think that the largest number, probably, of all these stateless people are Russians who lived in eastern Europe with Nansen passports, and have been moved into Nazi dominated countries and used as slave labour. They have not the nationality to go back to Yugoslavia, nor the desire; and this group of people became refugees for the second time.

The CHAIRMAN: Now define "others" for us, please.

Miss HAYWARD: "Others": I can only give you my guess of the explanation, because these are figures that come from UNRRA. I have no authoritative explanation. I believe, that this group of "others" also include some stateless people, and that it probably includes a number who would prefer to call themselves stateless rather than have a nationality established which would be that of a country controlled by Russia. As you know, there are no Ukrainians listed as such, and I should think that the explanation of this relatively large number of "others" is because a large part of the Ukrainian group are included in that group.

The occupations of the people in the displaced persons camps, include three or four divisions. There are some—something over ten per cent, probably—who work in camp administration. There are a number who are working with the occupation forces. I was told that in the British zone of Germany the number was 22,000. They are helping in the construction and the repair work that the army is doing. There are a number who work in the German economy. I believe that that is true of the British zones in Germany and Austria. So far as I know it is not true of the American zones. It is a difficult situation. These are people who want to work. There is work in some places to be done, but to take a job under a labour bureau which is run by German civilians, that is former Nazis, does not bespeak a fair consideration for the displaced person, and it is not a work which has any significance or any value for the future. To my mind the thing that is absolutely unthinkable is that the people who come out of concentration camps and who are used to slave labour by the Nazis should be forced into the civilian population. Apart from the question of how wise it would be to add that number to the population of Germany, it is on grounds of justice and morality, I think, quite impossible.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): You talked to these people yourself?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes, I talked to people in each camp.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Are the majority of them pro-Russian, or pro-British?



Miss HAYWARD: No. I explained the reason why they are non-repatriable—

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): I beg your pardon.

Miss HAYWARD: These people are called "non-repatriable".

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): All of them?

Miss HAYWARD: Practically all of this group. If people have refused for two years to return to their countries of origin, I do not think there is much likelihood that they will change their minds in the next month, and the expectation of the authorities is that all of the repatriation there will be finished at the time UNRRA closes down at the end of June.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Do you find a strong feeling of communism among them?

Miss HAYWARD: No. The basis of this problem is that they are anti-communistic.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Otherwise they would be in Russia.

Miss HAYWARD: That makes the great number of these people non-repatriable. Our government approved the resolution of the United Nations which said that a man should not be forced against his will to return to his country of origin if he has a valid reason to refuse.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): I think that is proper.

Miss HAYWARD: I do not see how we could take any other stand and be consistent with our democracy. But, having taken that stand, these people are then non-repatriable if they refuse to go back; and in taking that stand we acknowledge the responsibility to assist them in finding other homes, places of resettlement.

I just mention these three occupational groups to clear the way, because the group I want to talk about is the group of whom I saw the most, the group of people who are in the camp workshops, chiefly through the organization of UNRRA, by which, with the assistance of the army and the provision of machinery by some voluntary agencies, workshops have been established in each camp. There are workshops in which they provide some of the necessities of the camp life itself. For instance, every camp has a shoemaking shop, and there they take the second-hand shoes—

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Can anybody join those?

Miss HAYWARD: Any person who is a displaced person and living in those camps can either work there or train. You have your shoe-making shop in each camp. They have old shoes to repair, and footwear is very short in these camps. But they have not even got the cobblers' nails with which to work. I did not see any camp in which they were not using little wooden pegs instead of cobblers' nails. Every camp has its tailoring shop and dressmaking shops, and the clothes that were given in the UNRRA drive here and in the United States are taken and repaired and remade and every little scrap is used.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the relative number of men and women in those camps?

Miss HAYWARD: I think the last figures I received from the I.G.C. give 48 per cent men, 34 per cent women; and if that works out correctly, 18 per cent are children.

The CHAIRMAN: Children under the age of sixteen?

Miss HAYWARD: I think it is under the age of sixteen; sixteen or eighteen. There are other workshops in those camps and there are skills and trades going on for the needs of the camp or, in some cases, to supply materials that are needed in the German economy. I want to say that the camps



were not a specialty of one nationality. I made a point as fairly and objectively that I could go to see camps of each nationality in each zone. I found very beautiful jewellery being made at Meerbach, a camp in the British zone where there are 600 Baltic refugees. It is there that I went into the watch repair shop, and I should say again that watches can only be repaired if they have other useless ones from which to use spare parts. The whole story is one of a struggle to get the minimum of supplies that are needed. In this watch repair shop I found working and learning to repair watches two engineers who had worked in a factory in Riga. They showed me a camera that had been produced there. I doubt if it was an inch high or more than four or five inches wide. I thought it was a novelty at first until I learned that in the year 1938 Scotland Yard had ordered 4,000 of those cameras. When the Nazis went in they wanted that machinery. It was taken and the people working in the factory were forced into Germany and used as slave labour. Those engineers are sitting in a camp learning to repair watches and are using parts from disused watches.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What nationalities are those people?

Miss HAYWARD: Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians. In another camp to which I went there were about three or four thousand Ukrainians. That camp happens to be placed on the edge of Lunenburg Heaths, and the quarters in which the displaced persons live are the barracks or huts in which were formerly quartered the people of a training school for the German air force. Therefore, around that area of the training school at the end of the war there were a number of crashed planes. These displaced persons had salvaged the aluminum from the planes, and I saw excellent sets of tools and very fine kitchen utensils and electric irons which they had made from this salvaged aluminum. However, the iron sat on the shelf quite useless because, of course, they had no element to put inside it.

It is the same story in every case: a desire and an ability to work, but a shortage of fuel and power and supplies make any organized and productive work very difficult and at times impossible.

In another camp in the American zone, a camp of 4,500 Jews, 90 per cent of whom I believe had been in concentration camps, I saw lock-making with some excellent machinery. I saw heavy work, forging and welding, and, of course, the usual workshops like the tailoring and shoemaking shops, and so on. It was at this camp that I was told that the morale was as high or probably the highest in any camp in that area, and the reason which I was given and which I believe was that every employable person in that camp was either working or studying. You see, workshops are used, not only for the production of materials, but for training of other displaced persons. For instance, I found a former professor of mathematics who was taking a course in radio engineering. I found one lawyer who was learning to be a motor mechanic.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is making a useful citizen out of him.

The CHAIRMAN: Hear, hear.

Miss HAYWARD: The point is that intellectual and professional people are learning radio engineering, motor mechanics, carpentry, any sort of manual work, with the idea it will make them more acceptable to us as immigrants. The idea with them is that it will enable them to support themselves and get jobs here.

The CHAIRMAN: You say it will make them more acceptable to us? Are they figuring to come to us?

Miss HAYWARD: They hope to come.

The CHAIRMAN: To Canada?

Miss HAYWARD: Of course, but if we are not opening the doors to categories of college professors or intellectuals of other fields, they feel their chances may be better if they learn to be bricklayers and carpenters, etc. The point is that this cannot go on indefinitely. The morale of the men cannot be kept up by persuading them to take course after course on the assumption that they will one day get a permit to come here.

Hon. Mr. MURCHILL: Have these courses been arranged and established among themselves?

Miss HAYWARD: They have been arranged with the assistance of UNRRA and the armies. As I have said, some of the machinery has been provided by volunteer agencies while some has been requisitioned from the Germans. I do not think I saw greater enthusiasm anywhere than one morning when I went into a camp and found people cutting material for overcoats. That day they had received on order from the army for 270 overcoats and they had received dyed blankets with which to work. It was a useful thing and they had the material to work on. From the cutting room I went into the next room and was truly amazed to see a long table with thirty sewing machines. Now, in any other camp one or two sewing machines were precious. I could not understand this until I found they were requisitioned from a German firm which, of course, would want them back some time. It was not just a matter of making blankets for themselves, it was an army order.

The CHAIRMAN: What do they get for doing that work, anything?

Miss HAYWARD: They get something, but I cannot tell you whether in that particular case they would be paid in money or in coupons. Sometimes the workshop people are paid with coupons with which they can get extra supplies in the camp, if, in fact, there are any extra supplies to be obtained.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): How many people are there in this particular group that you are advocating?

Miss HAYWARD: I am not advocating any particular camp or group. I am speaking of the whole group. I have listed the figures. It is approximately one million people.

Hon. Mr. FERLAND: Are they more anxious to come to Canada or the United States than they are to go to other countries?

Miss HAYWARD: I think a great number of them are anxious to come to this continent. There are a great many who would like to come to Canada. I cannot give you any estimate of the figures, but there is no doubt in the world that there are a large number whose preference is for Canada.

Hon. Mr. FERLAND: They do not ask to be sent to South America? Did you hear of that?

Miss HAYWARD: It may be that some ask to be sent to South America, I do not know. I do know that South American countries have sent delegates to Europe and have offered them an opportunity to go to South America, and some people are going to accept the offer. I do not know whether they have a preference for South America or whether it is because of the fact that they have been waiting for two years and have seen no other countries open to them. I do not know the answer to that.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I assume that they all wish to leave Europe, and not go to other European countries.

Miss HAYWARD: I believe the general attitude is one of a desire to leave Europe altogether, but there are offers being made by European countries and I think that some of them will be accepted. For instance, it so happened that a delegation of four Norwegians came to Belsen the day I was there. They came with an invitation from the Norwegian Government to take 150 Jews from that

zone, and 600 Jews in all, because the Norwegians wish to replace the Norwegian Jews who were lost to the Nazis. There is also a plan whereby 20,000 miners are to go to Belgium, and those numbers will swell because the families will follow later. There is also an offer from France, which I believe starts with a number of 50,000. The indications are that France is willing to take more than that.

Since this subject has been brought up, perhaps I should go on and suggest other evidences of immigration projects that I saw while I was there. I was able to meet the Brazilian team in Austria. They were there to choose 5,000 people, and I have since heard from London that the first ship-load of something over 900 people has left for Brazil.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: That team would be an official team sent by the Brazilian Government?

Miss HAYWARD: Oh, yes. They had their officials including doctors, and were prepared to make their examinations and issue the permits.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How were they going to transport them?

Miss HAYWARD: As far as I know, by I.G.C.R. ships. The inter-governmental committee has chartered some ships. I am not certain of the number, but I think it is at least three, and they are prepared to use them for the transportation of groups of people from the displaced persons' camps. Naturally, they cannot afford to use those ships unless they take the full complement, I think, of 950.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Are we in a position to get a complement of 950 on one of the I.G.C. ships?

Miss HAYWARD: I cannot see why not. That is the complement of what I was told in London.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I am rather interested in the policies of the other countries together with the Canadian policy. Have you any information on that?

Miss HAYWARD: A delegation arrived in London from Venezuela before I left in the first week of April and they had come to choose 15,000 people. I also believe that the Argentine Government have already sent a representative to make an examination of the situation. There are other South American countries who are interested, but I cannot give the figures or anything specific on what their plans are. Another country which I want to mention is Great Britain. I think this committee is aware that Great Britain took 2,000 women to work in their hospitals last year, and that the plans worked so well that they are going to take another 5,000. However, that is merely a trifle to the decision made in February to take a large number of workers and, mark you, they did not say experts, just workers. One official of the government working on this project said he expected that movement, within two months from the time is started, to number 15,000 a month. I have since heard that the movement in the camps in that connection is being called, "Operation Western-Hol!" I wonder if it strikes you as ironically as it does me, that the hope of opportunity to them should not be the Western Hemisphere but Great Britain?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What about Australia?

Miss HAYWARD: I do not know exactly, but Australia was reported to be willing to take some, but what movement has started in that regard I cannot say. The countries I have mentioned are those for which I have figures, and as it has been suggested it might be well for us to compare Canada's policy with these projects.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: What is Canada doing so far as you are able to learn while you were there?



Miss HAYWARD: The immigration teams for the selection of relatives arrived in the British zone while I was there. They went to the camp at which a number were to be collected for examination, and I believe that that movement of examination of relatives who are eligible, has been going forward. Two or three groups of fifty each have arrived in this country. I wish to say that in many of the camps there were large numbers of people who wanted to speak to me, because they knew I came from Canada, and they wanted to come here, and because they had relatives here; and all too often it was my sad duty to tell them they could not come because they were not eligible. I know that the Order in Council for the admission of relatives has twice been broadened and that something is being done; but I hope that it will be broadened further.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: How far would you broaden it?

Miss HAYWARD: I would broaden it to include any relatives whatever, irrespective of the degree of relationship. The person is always guaranteed by a family here, and I cannot see what difference it makes whether a niece is eighteen or thirty-one years of age. I am thinking of a specific case, a woman of thirty-one years who is in Belsen. She was a member of a family of six and all the others went into the gas ovens or were murdered by the Nazis and she is left alone. She had a six months in Auschwitz and a year at Belsen previously, but she has had two years in Belsen since, waiting in the same place, though conditions are different. This lady has an uncle and an aunt in Canada who want to bring her here and care for her. I do not see why the regulations should not be broadened to include such a case. The idea in the beginning was I think to keep a restrictive classification.

I wish I could make all understand what it means to wait for two years in a camp and not even be able to register or to apply. The conditions under which these people live are so depressing and very deteriorating. The only thing that keeps up the morale and will hold those people is the feeling that they are going some place, that there is a definite hope of immigration even if they have to wait sometime for it. That is why I would make the regulations now, and let these people register. It has taken months to pick a group of people for immigration. There are obstacles and difficulties which slow down progress both on this side and in Europe; but if the regulations stated that a larger group would be eligible then some of the work could be done.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): I presume those people all belong to different religions?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes, they belong to different religions. There are Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Greek Catholics, Russian Orthodox and Confessionals. I cannot give you the figures for each, but there is among them those various religious affiliations.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: And they are still hanging on to their faith.

Miss HAYWARD: Nothing but that faith, and their faith in the democratic principles and in us maintains them. That, I must say, is the real reason why we have to help them. People do not live through concentration camps and endure slave labour just on physical strength; there was that moral courage of resistance to Nazism and the feeling that they had the Allied armies back of them. It was that moral courage and faith in the democratic principles of the people who were fighting for them that made it possible for these persons to endure. But that is not the end of the story. They endure on that faith, and what happens? If they wait two years and the people who fought for those principles do nothing, what will happen to their faith in us?

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): If we searched the continent over we would not find a better advocate than yourself. You have made a great impression, and God Almighty will bless you and bless them.



Miss HAYWARD: That is very good of you, but I feel very strongly on the subject. If we who fought for the principles of individual rights as opposed to totalitarian power fail these people it will create in them a cynicism; and if we do not live up to our principles and act on them it will cause a weakness and cynicism within ourselves. We have to stop and ask ourselves: do we really believe in these things that we say about freedom, and if we do are we going to leave three million people living three persons to a room on a diet I cannot describe but which you can well imagine for two years?

In all my visits to the camps no person complained about the conditions. They are bad but are not unendurable for a time, but it cannot be called a permanent home. Those conditions can only be endured by one who has a feeling that maybe in six months or a year he will eventually get out of it.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Tell us what we can do. What can I do; what can this committee do?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Force an immigration policy upon the government.

Hon. Mr. FERLAND: Are these people in good health?

Miss HAYWARD: I think generally speaking their health is good. I have not made the medical examinations myself, and I cannot say but I pass this on to you that the people who were ill when the war ended were taken to hospital. When we are looking for healthy people we must remember that Sweden took 10,000 people from the concentration camps who were ill; others were taken to Switzerland and they are maintained in hospitals operated by UNRRA and the occupation forces. The people whose health was really bad were taken out and given special care; the others for a time had extra rations for a period after liberation, and I think their health was built up.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you describe the food they get?

Miss HAYWARD: The rations are supposed to be 1550 calories a day in the British zone and 2100 calories in the American zone, with supplements for people who are doing heavy work. I am quite sure that when I was there in February it was not possible for the officials to provide that minimum diet, and I believe it has become much worse since. For myself I know that 1550 calories does not mean very much; you will not starve to death quickly on that diet but your health will deteriorate.

I asked one woman whom I visited what she had to eat the day before. In these camps they have a central kitchen where they prepare a sort of soup. I say "sort of" because I do not know exactly what it is. It was a brown substance but was certainly not coloured by the amount of meat in it; it had been thickened with potato. The people who like to live *en famille* prefer to go with their little tin and get a can of this soup and take it to their rooms and eat it there. It was most unappetizing and certainly does not have much nourishment in it. When I asked this woman what she had the day previously and found that in addition to the soup she had some ersatz coffee, a bit of herring and bread fried in cod liver oil. There is a small ration of butter and sugar for a month, but it is so small that it goes very quickly. That was all she had been able to have. I cannot say that every day in every camp conditions are as bad as those I describe, but I do know that they were so short that the minimum ration was not being met.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Miss Hayward, could you tell us something about the orphan children, how many there are and how they are cared for?

Miss HAYWARD: There were only about 3,000 unaccompanied children in the British zone of Germany; I was not given a figure for the American zone, but my guess is that it is not more than 5,000. In other words, there are very few orphan children in the camps. The children that are there are well cared for. I was not able to visit those particular camps because I concentrated on the

people who are eligible for immigration. The problem of children is rather a different one. There were a large number of unaccompanied children among the displaced persons, and by a very great effort on the part of UNRRA officials some relatives were found; there were no parents to be found, but they were able to locate some member of the family, and the child joined the family. In other cases there was an effort made to learn the national background of the child, and wherever it could be discovered that the parents of the child had been Czechoslovakian, French or whatever European nationality it might be, that country took the child and cared for it. One can understand the desire of these people because their country depends upon the next generation.

In the camps I visited I found kindergartens, primary schools and every effort is given to provide proper care to those young children. But there are either one or two parents present in the camp. I think Canada could well take some children with the parents.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Is there not an organization in the United States that was formed for the purpose of bringing out orphan children?

Miss HAYWARD: That is one thing that was provided for by the relatives for a small number of children that were left. But as I say there were not more than 3,000 children in the British zone and maybe a little more in the American zone, that is, known largely as D.P.'s.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: There are a good many in Switzerland.

Miss HAYWARD: Yes, a good number in Switzerland. I hope that if we are asked to place some of these children there will surely be no difficulty in getting permits to place them. There is no doubt about the willingness of Canadians to take them. But in the camps there is the difficulty that one parent is present and the problem arises as to whether we are willing to take in broken families. On a humanitarian basis that might be the most helpful thing we could do.

I was asked previously what we could do, and in answer I can only refer to the point that was made in our brief of last year—distinguish between the refugee policy and the immigration policy. I had hoped that special regulations could be made for displaced persons. I wish to leave that point, because I think Mr. Sandwell will speak about it.

There is one further point I should like to make, and I will stop shortly. I have just travelled to British Columbia and back speaking on this subject, and found no province in objection to the idea that Canada should do something to assist displaced persons. I think I can truthfully say that the response was not based on the economic advantage or the material gain that we would realize in the matter of trades or professions, rather on the feeling that Canada should make her contribution.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What bodies did you address?

Miss HAYWARD: I spoke to the Women's Canadian Club group, some joint clubs, two or three meetings called by the United Nations, the Rotary Club and general meetings of that sort.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What seems to me to be lacking is the concentrated public opinion across Canada on this subject. Did you observe any such public opinion starting in any town or community that you visited?

Miss HAYWARD: I think favourable support is there, but it is scattered across the country. It is not within the power of one locality or club to make a statement on the subject but the impression one gets in talking to individuals and speaking to various clubs is always a response to the idea that Canada should do something and do it more quickly.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Resolutions on this matter have gone from various national organizations: for instance, the National Council of Women.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Public opinion is the thing that makes governments act. I cannot understand why the different communities around have not been touched by this, and that somebody has not started a movement for government action.

Miss HAYWARD: I think that that public opinion and that humanitarian response existed at the end of the war, but that it was so frequently stated that "nothing can be done just now until the service people are home and there are ships", that the impression has rather dropped from public attention. But that support is there.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: Do you not believe that it would be possible for public organizations to realize this present condition, that there is an interest and that it is not organized, and that perhaps we should organize public opinion on this displaced person problem. I think that in no way could you or others interested in the work contribute more than by building up public opinion in Canada in an organized way. The interest prevails, no doubt, but as you say, it seems to be disorganized and not centralized through any channels.

Miss HAYWARD: It appears to be disorganized. It actually exists in practically every group."

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: But no person assumes the responsibility for it.

Miss HAYWARD: No. That is the job we tried to do. But this is a private committee working on voluntary contributions, with very little organization. This small paper is put out by this committee, and the latest issue has a good deal of the report which I have made this morning. You will be pleased to know that the Canadian Institute of International Affairs is including this in their study kit on immigration, and it has a good distribution. There is an interest, because all over the country study groups and organizations are asking for this bulletin. It could be, of course, organized in a much bigger and more effective way.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: I believe that is something that should be done, and thereby we would build up public opinion, and public opinion would exert more pressure on the government to take action.

Miss HAYWARD: I am taking up too much time. You want to hear Dr. Sandwell.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I would not hurry. There is a government committee that is well aware of this problem, is there not?

Miss HAYWARD: I believe so.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Did you come in contact with them while you were in Europe?

Miss HAYWARD: You mean, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Miss HAYWARD: Yes, I came in contact with them, because they were good enough to get the military permits and make the arrangements. I really went from one office of theirs to the next.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Is there a Canadian representative on this committee?

Miss HAYWARD: The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is an international body, a small league of nations, of which Canada is a member, so our representative for any particular meeting is the delegate who is appointed by the government. The staff of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is not made up on the basis of nationality, but it does happen that the head of the Department of Settlement and Emigration is a Canadian.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Who is he?



Miss HAYWARD: Wing Commander R. Innes. But he is there in the same way that a Canadian may be a member of the Secretariat of the United States.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Has this organization made any representations to countries that they should take immediate action to do something in this respect?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes. They have discussed it with the governments who are members of their organization.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Do you know what, if anything, was suggested to Canada?

Miss HAYWARD: I do not know what specific proposals they made, and if I know anything about the way they work, I do not suppose it would be made in the matter of a specific proposal, but they would discuss with Canadian government officials what groups or classes Canada was prepared to take.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Other countries, like Great Britain and Brazil, must have taken some direct action to send a governmental committee to make selections and arrange for the transportation of these people to these countries. Is not that so?

Miss HAYWARD: Well, they would make the arrangements with the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees to send a delegation, the government having previously decided that they were prepared to do so. The Intergovernmental Committee makes the arrangements which make it possible to do this work, and in some cases the Intergovernmental Committee has arranged for transportation. I do not know who finances it. I know that the Intergovernmental Committee has a few chartered ships.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: So far as Canada is concerned, in order to accomplish anything they would have to have a committee from Canada to make the selections and arrange for transportation?

Miss HAYWARD: Not any more than we already have. You do not need a committee to say to the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees that the Canadian government has decided to take, say, fifty or a hundred from each of these occupational groups. That would be a governmental decision. Then the Department of Immigration would simply notify their officials away in Germany and Austria—we have investigating teams now—to examine people for the permits on these qualifications. The set-up is there.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: So it is just a case of getting some action.

Miss HAYWARD: Expending it and getting a government decision to do something special in regard to the special group.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You say the set-up is there. Is that in the British occupied areas?

Miss HAYWARD: I mean, that the Canadian Department of Immigration—

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: The officials go right into the areas in Germany, do they?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes. When I say "the set-up is there" I mean that our Department of Immigration already has immigration officials in the zones.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: And doctors who make the examinations?

Miss HAYWARD: Yes. There is an immigration official with a doctor and a security officer—from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—who make up a team. There are two teams there now. If they are instructed to examine another group, I mean to give permits on the basis of another category admissible, they can go ahead and do it. It is quite true that if we begin to bring in many more people they will have to have more than two immigration teams, but the immigrations teams are simply working because we have not one particular



office set up in Germany, and it is much better, because these people cannot move about. The immigration team moves about instead of waiting for the people to go to one particular office.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: The International Refugee Committee was set up by the United Nations, and as I recall, after it was set up it issued an appeal to members of the United Nations Organization to co-operate in solving this problem by accepting as many as possible of these people who were in these zones, both displaced persons and refugees. So that I think representations in that way came to Canada the same as they came, I presume, to other countries.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Then this can be done without any formal reference to the Intergovernmental Committee?

Miss HAYWARD: It could be done; but it will be welcomed by the preparatory committee; that is the point. Canada has shown by her participation in the planning of the organization—you see, it took months to discuss what kind of organization we would set up, which would discuss what would then be done for refugees. We have participated in that. I do not think there is any doubt Canada expects to take her part in the carrying out of that. For there is no doubt that we will pay our 3·5 per cent of the operational expenses; and I suggest that there is no reason to wait for that organization to get under way, and I also suggest that it is a wiser and better use of money to spend it to resettle people than to go on year after year making a contribution to the International Refugee Organization for maintenance. That is what it is going to be,—\$100,000,000 a year to keep people.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: It appears to me that the problem is one of policy for Canada to decide. If for instance within the next week the decision is made to greatly enlarge the area of people who can be brought to Canada, the International Refugee Organization would throw its hat in the air.

Miss HAYWARD: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Without any question. I think there is a growing feeling in Canada that we should do something and do it quickly in this matter. Twice in the past year the government has passed their regulations—I do not know the scope—covering those who could be brought to this country; and on each occasion the action had favourable notice in the press and by some public bodies.

Miss HAYWARD: Well, Senator Crerar, those expansions have been made in general immigration, and it is understandable that if a regulation is made to broaden general immigration it can only be for certain trades and skills in which we can take a relatively large number. Is it not possible to make a special regulation, not for an unlimited number, but, say, in reference to displaced persons only, that we are prepared to take a wider category? Would not that get the most effective action?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Quite. I quite agree with that; and if that were done it would grant the request of the International Refugee Organization, that each country do its share.

Miss HAYWARD: That really is what we would like to see—a special regulation, without waiting until we are asked to do it as part of IRO.

The CHAIRMAN: Miss Hayward, we are very much obliged to you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Before you go: they are talking about widening the class of relatives admissible. You will observe that in this Committee's report to the Senate at the last session we went as far as to include friends, our philosophy being that the best immigrant that we can have is somebody who comes to a Canadian who has already established himself and who takes

the responsibility if looking after the new immigrant both in maintenance and teaching him the Canadian way of life. This Committee has expressed itself a number of times on that point. We would go just as far as you have gone.

Miss HAYWARD: Yes. I saw that in the report, and was glad. That, you see, will provide for a relatively small proportion of people from the displaced persons group. We think that should be done, but that in itself is not enough.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course, we do not take objection to bringing the nearest relatives first; that would be in the nature of things; but we do hope as we clear away the present classifications the government will extend the classes further and further until we take in friends as well. But our real trouble at the present moment seems to be to get governmental action in the way of ships.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you again.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Sandwell is next; and then we have the Mayors of Ottawa and London for a presentation on the part of the Mayors' Association.

Mr. B. K. SANDWELL, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is no necessity for my taking up very much of your time on a subject on which you have been very fully informed. I appeared before you, of course, a year ago. Circumstances have developed a good deal since then; but I am glad we happen to be here to-day, because it enables me to refer to some of the things that we told you before we came on the scene. It is true that we are here on behalf of the so-called displaced persons, but I want to assure you that we are not here endeavouring to produce a substitute for any long term immigration policy. We perfectly realize that the matter we are bothering you with is immediate policy, and has very little to do with what you decide about long term immigration policy; but it happens to be an urgent matter and it is one in which we think we can avail ourselves of the influence of your committee to help us in getting something done.

May I say also that there is no danger of committing yourself on behalf of any pro-Nazis or Quislings by doing anything on behalf of the displaced persons. There is a perfectly clear definition of displaced persons. There is no question as to whether anybody is or is not a displaced person. The category of them is quite clearly laid down by this document, the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, and the definition of displaced persons includes this:—

Members who will not be the concern of the organization—

- (1) War criminals, Quislings and traitors.
- (2) Any other persons who can be shown
  - (a) To have assisted the enemy in persecuting the civilian population of countries members of the United Nations, or
  - (b) To have voluntarily assisted the enemy forces since the outbreak of the second world war in their operations against the United Nations.

All such persons are automatically out of the category of displaced persons, and anything that we are advocating has nothing to do with them whatever. We are also asking your assistance in making it easier to bring to this country displaced persons without reference to their occupational class. That is to say, without any attempt to distinguish between labour and farming classes as against professors. We dislike that kind of discrimination as we dislike discrimination of the matter of religious and racial origin. These people interest us because they are displaced persons and they have nowhere to go and they want to come to one of the newer countries of the world. Some reference has been made in the discussion to the lack of any organized effort on behalf of these people. It is true that our committee is practically the only organization

which is primarily devoted to that sort of work, but I should like to remind the committee that practically all of the large trade union organizations have passed a resolution in favour of just the sort of thing that we are asking you to help us bring about.

Since I appeared before you last, there has been a very considerable degree of progress in almost everything except the receptivity of the attitude of Canada towards the displaced persons. That has enlarged, I think I am right in saying, only in regard to the matter of the extension of degree of relationship which entitles a displaced person to be brought into Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have agriculturists and farm labourers.

Dr. SANDWELL: Yes, quite so. The point I want to make is that the situation is now very much clearer than it was when I appeared before you last year. I am not sure whether this definition of displaced persons, whether this international agreement concerning the handling of them had even been drawn up at that time, but another development which has taken place during the year is the knowledge which we have acquired concerning the reasons why these people are not repatriable. That has already been touched upon, but I do want to accentuate this a little. They are not repatriable in a great majority of cases because they do not desire to return to a country which is under an authoritarian form of government. They want to live under a democratic form of government, and for that reason they want to come to Canada, the United States, to one of the South American countries, or to any other country with a reasonable prospect of remaining democratic. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary for me to take up your time any longer.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Chairman, we are honoured with the presence of Mayor Lewis of Ottawa and Mayor Wenige of London. They came as the result of the invitation we sent to the Mayors Association to make representations to this committee.

MAYOR GEORGE A. WENIGE (*London, Ontario*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the city of London, back in January of this year, a resolution was brought in by a number of citizens, and the City Council passed this resolution and sent it on to the major cities of the Dominion, with varieties of successes. A number of cities replied that they were endorsing it while smaller cities replied that they were not endorsing it. I have here the resolution that was passed by the City Council, and with your permission I shall be very glad to read this resolution. I think the other resolutions are in the hands of Mayor Lewis of the city of Ottawa. This is dated January 30, 1947.

WHEREAS the Dominion of Canada is endowed with tremendous natural resources, and has thousands of square miles of vacant land awaiting development;

And whereas this vast territory is vulnerable and open to aggression and the existing population is insufficient to provide the required protection through its own efforts;

And whereas, with a population of approximately twelve million people it is obvious that vast numbers of persons could be absorbed under a well-regulated and orderly immigration policy, and this may be the last opportunity in which Canada may freely select the immigrants who are to build up her population;

And whereas in the countries of Europe there are innumerable persons desirous of migrating to Canada, and it is considered, on the strongest available evidence, that many of such persons could and would bring to this country a wealth of tradition, ingenuity, ability in mechanical and similar trades and valuable knowledge in the professions and in every division of business and industrial life;



And whereas it is believed that through such orderly immigration thousands of such persons could be absorbed through the facilities provided by their friends and relatives already resident in Canada, without placing further strain upon our housing facilities and without harm to the domestic economy, but rather with benefit to the country as a whole, in particular those fields of labour where the demand for additional workers is heavy;

Therefore be it resolved that this Council urge upon the Dominion Government the advisability of placing in operation, immediately, an immigration policy designed to encourage the admission to Canada of selected immigrants from Europe, with a view to the relief of distressing conditions on the European continent, and especially with the intention of adding to Canada's population, in orderly and well-regulated manner, a group of citizens from whom this country could expect to receive heavy dividends in the arts, sciences and in every department of the life of the people of Canada;

And that the major cities in Canada be requested to endorse this resolution and urge the Dominion Government to take favourable action thereon:

That is the resolution passed in open council.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Can you tell us, Mr. Wenige, what cities approved this, or how many approved it?

Mr. WENIGE: Off hand I would be unable to tell you that, but I have in mind cities such as Windsor and Chatham. Those cities stand out in my mind very well.

The CHAIRMAN: St. Thomas?

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, St. Thomas, and the central cities were all in favour of them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Toronto?

The CHAIRMAN: Ottawa?

Mr. WENIGE: Ottawa did not, but Toronto did as did Kingston. Those are the principal ones I have in mind.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: What about cities like Winnipeg?

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, the city of Winnipeg and the city of Calgary, and others of those western cities. We should be very glad to send your committee a copy of all those from which we received favourable endorsements.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Do send us that would you? We should like to have that. Now, is there anything that you would like to say yourself, Mr. Wenige?

Mr. WENIGE: I should like to say that, taking our own city as an example, we are short of manual labour: Mechanics, carpenters, steel workers, and all that sort of thing. I am sure that we could absorb quite a number of people if we had them.

The CHAIRMAN: How are your hospitals and your children's homes for women's help?

Mr. WENIGE: We have not enough. We are short of nurses. Every day hospitals are begging people to work part-time. Women leave their own homes and their own children to work in the hospitals a few days in order to help out, and they do it from a patriotic standpoint. Naturally they earn some money for that work, but we certainly need help in the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Wenige, I see in these figures supplied by Miss Hayward and coming from UNRRA, that there are carpenters in the displaced camps receiving UNRRA assistance, in the numbers of 5,569. There are also 1,808 bricklayers, and there are a great number of electricians. I suppose you are building houses in London?



Mr. WENIGE: Yes, and we could absorb any amount of these workmen.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There are 3,467 electricians. There are a great many house painters, numbering 1,169. They are not the fellows who paint little pictures, they are interior, exterior and sign spray painters.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 830 masons listed.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, and there are steel workers, plumbers and steam fitters, glaziers, and so on.

Mr. WENIGE: I might mention to you gentlemen that we have in London now something in the neighbourhood of 400 houses under construction. What I mean is that we have the foundations laid and we have been successful in getting quite a bit of material in the last three or four months, particularly lumber. However, we have not got the carpenters to put the lumber in the houses. The result of that is that these structures are standing idle. We have one case where 67 houses out of 74 are unoccupied because they are incomplete, incomplete to the extent that they are not habitable yet for people to move in because the roofs have not been put on or the floors have not been laid.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I see that this list presented by Miss Hayward shows that there are 199 nurses. You mentioned the need for nurses, did you not?

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, our hospitals are looking for them all the time.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The list shows that there are 343 hospital attendants and orderlies. There are some midwives, and I suppose you could use some of them.

Mr. WENIGE: That comes under the heading of nursing.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, they are separately listed here.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I might say that the list shows that there are 3,891 female nurses. I believe Senator Roebuck was speaking of 199 male nurses.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, yes. I was reading the male number. The male nurses are 199 in number and the female nurses are 3,891, and our hospitals are crying out for nurses.

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, we are adding to our hospitals and making more bedrooms and there are not enough nurses. There are not enough nurses nor enough orderlies.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I suppose you have people in your city who have relatives in these camps?

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, any number of them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Who would be very glad to take care of their relatives from Europe upon their arrival in Canada?

Mr. WENIGE: Yes, and guarantee their expenses and maintenance until they would be absorbed into the work. I know that they would eventually get into work. We have in the rural districts of London any number of farmers who have relatives—Ukraines, Danes, and Swedes—and they cannot hire men on their farms. Their relatives would come out here and it would mean not only that their particular farm would be developed but also farms generally. They would be the type of people to bring out. Their relatives here have made good and there is no reason why they should not make good also.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The list discloses that there are also many farmers, railway workers, and so on.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Wenige, would it be practical to form a municipal organization to assist in getting some of these people out to the district of London or even the community?

Mr. WENIGE: Do you mean local organizations to finance this work?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: No, to organize. I am just thinking out loud, but would it not be practical to get together a representative group who would be

willing to assist in bringing relatives from the displaced persons camps or from sections of Europe, have them advertise this project to the local community and then present something specific to the Immigration Committee and force them to take action to see that that was brought about?

Mr. WENIGE: I do not think there would be the slightest trouble in doing that. These foreign born men and women moved to this country many years ago and made good, and when their relatives over there need help they will unhesitatingly organize and guarantee assistance to them. When I say they will guarantee their assistance I have in mind the fact that these people own their own homes. In my experience, and as mayor of London for many years, I have discovered that when this type of people move to a city of that size they buy their own homes. That is a first essential with them; they must own their own homes. Their guarantee would mean something; they would take care of them. I do not think there would be any trouble creating a local organization in any municipality for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Wenige, I know of the excellent work you have done in housing in your city, and I think some leadership in the local communities is required to bring this to the attention of the government and force immediate action so far as displaced persons are concerned.

Mr. WENIGE: As an individual I would not hesitate two minutes in undertaking that if it is the suggestion of this particular body.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: As a member of this committee I should like to suggest it as a test. I know it could not be in any better hands than yours. We have been doing all we can to bring this matter to the attention of the public and the government. Certain recommendations were made in our report last year which have not yet been fully carried out. As a member of the committee I would like very much to see you start out with an organization in your community.

Mr. WENIGE: I would be very glad to do so if it would assist in the general work in spreading public opinion, but the main thing now is that time is of the essence. We cannot put this off until next year or the year after. Gentlemen, if we can get these people out on the next boat, that should be done. That is my picture of the situation.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Mr. Wenige, I have been a member of this committee for a few years, and now with the war over two years I am hearing nothing new as to the conditions in Europe. Senator Campbell suggests that another committee be formed. It is my opinion that there are too many committees at the present time. It is my humble opinion that we as members of this committee and members of the government should go to the government and get something definite and get it quickly. If we are going to bring people over here, let us get to work and do it, and not shift the responsibility from one committee to another. If the government is going to do something now is the time to do it. We should not ask the mayors, the aldermen and the rest of the people to do anything, but we should go right to the government and get a "yes" or "no". The government is like the city councils of Canada, it takes a long time to get anything done.

Mr. WENIGE: The great difficulty is that the committees are too big. If on a committee of fifty forty-nine died something would be done.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The committee is like all municipalities—I have had a little experience in them—it takes a long time to get something put through. We have heard to-day of the conditions in Europe. Miss Hayward gave a very outstanding story of conditions as she found them. In our committee yesterday we had the railways tell us about the different types of soil and a lot of other nonsense. The shipping companies say they cannot get boats to bring

these people out. Personally, I do not believe that; I think we could very easily get boats on the way in one week. As to how many carpenters and other tradesmen we should have; I am not sure; I am not one who would be in favour of opening wide our doors. We have people in Montreal to-day who cannot find a house to live in, as you also have them in London; we have people who cannot get into a hospital for care. My wife and daughter work in hospitals a day or two each week wrapping bandages and things like that. But we have got to be sure that we are going to get these people here. If they are as badly off as we are told, they cannot be very happy at these camps. But let us get them here.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Senator Hushion, do you remember the gentleman by the name of McKay who told us a similar story to that of Miss Hayward's and that we were very much moved by his remarks? We said then, "we have got to do something right away; we have got to get to the Prime Minister." We said that we wanted Mr. McKay to meet the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour and get this story right to the throne. Was that not the idea?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes, I moved the resolution.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: We had a select committee from this committee, consisting of the chairman, Senator Roebuck and some others to get in touch with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Immigration so that we would arrange a short cut and get right to the top. That was a couple of months ago, and what has happened?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The Prime Minister was away; when he came back we took a recess. That is the answer.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: My point is that this committee does not seem to be able to get any action from the government. Senator Campbell suggested another way this morning by trying to get public opinion outside aroused.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: The public knows the situation as well as we do; and everybody knows that.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make my suggestion perfectly clear. As Senator Burchill has said, I moved a resolution that a committee be formed to be sent to the Prime Minister, to meet him along with the members of the opposition, Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Bracken with Mr. McKay present. That gentleman told a story very much like the one we heard this morning from Miss Hayward. Circumstances developed which has made it impossible for that committee to meet. I am not sure what success it would have in putting the case before the Prime Minister and the leaders of the opposition, but I am perfectly certain that from one end of this country to the other there are hundreds of relatives of people in Europe who are uncertain themselves as to what they should do to get their relatives out here, and as to what they can do. My suggestion is that if we could form local committees to assist in organizing these people, give them some sort of advice and help that it would bring the matter specifically to the attention of the Immigration Department.

Every lawyer from one end of the country to the other is daily confronted with problems that arise in this field, but there must be hundreds and thousands of people who do not put forth the effort to consult someone. We have heard this morning from the Mayor of London and I know something about his ability and leadership in matters of this kind. I believe it would be a very good test to see what can be brought about in municipalities from that standpoint. I realize we have to have governmental action on the matter and I have already suggested to Senator Roebuck this morning that this committee might very well meet with Mr. Howe who is acting as Minister of Immigration, also the Minister of Labour, and see what action can be taken. If we leave it until we make our report it will be too late; the report will be filed away and no attention will be paid to it.



Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I do not approve of that policy; it is just a further delay. If these children are entitled to come here, and they have relatives here it is up to the government to see that they get here. We should not run around from one committee to the other and calling on the Prime Minister—he is human and understands the situation. The immigration department does not speak up. I have written them fourteen letters in the last two weeks and I can scarcely get a reply. Why should we ask some outsiders to do what we should do ourselves?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I am not suggesting that outsiders do it; I suggest that a committee of the Senate carry it out.

Mr. WENIGE: All your organizations put together have not done a thing in two years. That is the answer. I think I have a right to express myself in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the reason why it would be well for the towns and cities to take action.

Mr. WENIGE: Provided the action taken by the committees of the cities will ultimately be observed by your government if they are not asleep when the reports come in.

The CHAIRMAN: We are much obliged to you, Mr. Wenige.

May I now call Mayor Lewis of Ottawa.

Mayor STANLEY LEWIS: On behalf of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities I want to thank the Senate Committee for inviting us to present our views.

On April 10, 1947, Senator the Honourable A. W. Roebuck, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Immigration, wrote to Mayor Garnet Coulter, K.C., of Winnipeg, President of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, inviting the Federation to present the views of the municipalities on Immigration, to his Committee.

Mayor Coulter replied to Senator Roebuck, acknowledging the invitation, and stated:—

As you will understand, the Executive of the Federation is handicapped in declaring a matter of policy without reference having first been made to the annual general Conference, which will be held this year on July 8th to 11th in Winnipeg. Therefore, until a general policy as to the attitude on immigration has been reached at the forthcoming Conference, it will not be possible to make an official representation to the Senate Committee which carries the authority of the Federation. I expect that it will be too late for the purposes of the Senate Committee to wait until the Federation Conference.

Mayor Coulter pointed out, however, that the Council of the City of London, Ontario, had passed a strong resolution urging the immediate adoption of a policy designed to encourage immigration from the British Isles and Europe; that this resolution, as well as having been widely distributed for individual municipal support, by the City of London, had also been referred to the Federation for consideration at its forthcoming conference; and that in order to get a quick sampling of the general attitude of municipalities across the country on the question of immigration, this resolution would be immediately sent out by the Federation to its member municipalities, with a request that they indicate at the earliest possible moment their council's stand on the matter, with the resolution of the City of London as the basis for consideration.

The resolution was accordingly sent out to the Federation's members, advising them of the invitation from the Senate Committee, and asking that the matter be considered by their Councils and the Federation be immediately advised of their action thereon.



Text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the Dominion of Canada is endowed with tremendous natural resources, and has thousands of square miles of vacant land awaiting development;

And whereas this vast territory is vulnerable and open to aggression and the existing population is insufficient to provide the required protection through its own efforts;

And whereas, with a population of approximately twelve million people it is obvious that vast numbers of persons could be absorbed under a well-regulated and orderly immigration policy, and this may be the last opportunity in which Canada may freely select the immigrants who are to build up her population;

And whereas in the countries of Europe there are innumerable persons desirous of migrating to Canada, and it is considered, on the strongest available evidence, that many of such persons could and would bring to this country a wealth of tradition, ingenuity, ability in mechanical and similar trades and valuable knowledge in the professions and in every division of business and industrial life;

And whereas it is believed that through such orderly immigration thousands of such persons could be absorbed through the facilities provided by their friends and relatives already resident in Canada, without placing further strain upon our housing facilities and without harm to the domestic economy, but rather with benefit to the country as a whole, in particular those fields of labour where the demand for additional workers is heavy:

Therefore be it resolved that this Council urge upon the Dominion Government the advisability of placing in operation, immediately, an immigration policy designed to encourage the admission to Canada of selected immigrants from Europe, with a view to the relief of distressing conditions on the European Continent, and especially with the intention of adding to Canada's population, in orderly and well-regulated manner, a group of citizens from whom this country could expect to receive heavy dividends in the arts, sciences and in every department of the life of the people of Canada;

And that the major cities in Canada be requested to endorse this resolution and urge the Dominion Government to take favourable action thereon.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: That team would be an official team sent by the

Replies to the request for opinion were received from 96 municipalities, with populations ranging from 466 to 271,597. Of these, 37 endorsed the resolution as it stands; and 17 endorsed it with certain qualifications or reservations. Only two stated definitely that the subject matter of the resolution was "not endorsed"; and two reported that their councils had "no comment" to make.

Fourteen municipalities reported that the resolution was ordered "filed"; eleven stated that no action had been taken; two felt that this was a matter to be decided by the Dominion Government and made no other comment; one referred it back to the Federation for conference consideration without taking a stand; and some 10 reported that the matter had been "laid over" for later consideration; or that their councils did not feel they had had time for adequate consideration before expressing their opinion.

The following tables may be of interest in indicating the distribution and size of municipalities endorsing the resolution, and not endorsing, filing, etc.:—

MUNICIPALITIES ENDORSING (IN FULL OR IN PART) PRINCIPLE OF  
A POLICY DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE IMMIGRATION

Population Group	B.C.	Alta.	Sask.	Man.	Ont.	Que.	N.B.	N.S.	Totals
100,000 and over.....	1	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	3
50,000-100,000 .....	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	2
20,000-50,000 .....	3	..	1	..	2	1	1	..	8
10,000-20,000 .....	..	1	..	1	8	..	..	1	11
5,000-10,000 .....	5	..	1	..	4	1	..	..	11
Under 5,000 .....	7	4	3	1	4	2	..	2	23
Totals .....	16	5	6	2	19	5	1	4	58

As indicated in the Table above, 58 municipalities out of 98 replying endorsed the resolution urging an active immigration policy, either as it was presented or with reservations and/or recommendations.

The strongest recurring recommendation was that emphasis be laid on immigrants from the British Isles, and that in all immigration the *selective* principle be stressed. One of those municipalities endorsing would "restrict immigration to selected British stock and Scandinavians, for occupation in agriculture and mines".

Other points heavily stressed were the necessity of effectively dealing with the present housing problem and guaranteeing maintained employment for the people of Canada before any immigration on a major scale is undertaken; and the desirability of careful selection with respect to health and physical qualifications and background ensuring ready assimilation into our democratic system. The importance of retaining our own citizens through adequate solution of problems which lead to emigration from Canada was also emphasized.

Similar points were raised by a number of those replying who did not endorse the principle of the resolution, and a number who did not wish either to endorse or refuse to endorse the resolution pointed out the necessity, in their opinion, of solving the problems of housing and employment for Canadians before embarking on any immigration program.

The distribution of replies not endorsing, filing, or otherwise expressing a definite opinion on the matter is as follows:—

MUNICIPALITIES NOT ENDORSING, FILING, OR DECLINING TO  
TAKE ACTION ON THE RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Population Group	B.C.	ALTA.	SASK.	MAN.	ONT.	QUE.	N.B.	N.S.	Totals
100,000 and over .....	..	..	..	1	3	..	..	..	4
50,000-100,000 .....	2	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	4
20,000-50,000 .....	..	1	..	..	10	5	..	2	18
10,000-20,000 .....	1	1	..	..	5	..	..	..	7
5,000-10,000 .....	1	..	..	1	..	1	..	1	3
Under 5,000 .....	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	1	4
Totals .....	2	3	2	2	19	7	1	4	40

Population represented by the 58 municipalities endorsing in whole or in part, or with special recommendations as indicated, the immigration policy set forth in the resolution above referred to amounts to 1,262,247.

Population represented by the 40 municipalities opposing such a policy or declining to express an opinion thereon amounts to 2,027,812.\*

\*Of this total, 4 cities with a population of more than 100,000 each account for 1,145,713, leaving 37 municipalities in this group with a total population of 282,099.

Replies were received from 39 per cent of the municipalities written to. 56.8 per cent of those replying favoured the adoption of a constructive policy

designed to encourage immigration with main emphasis first on British stock, second Scandinavian; with careful selection particularly with regard to health and general physical requirements and background which would make for good assimilation into the Canadian way of life.

43.2 per cent did not endorse the resolution, or otherwise declined to express an opinion, for various reasons—among those expressed being the situation, both present and potential, in Canada in the matters of housing and employment for Canadians. Others felt they had not had time to thoroughly consider such an important matter and did not at the moment feel competent to express an opinion thereon.

The resolution will be presented for consideration at the Federation's forthcoming conference, to be held in Winnipeg, July 8th to 11th next, at which time it may be possible to get a more authoritative expression of the policy to be pursued by the Federation's Executive.

In the meantime, as indicated by the President of the Federation, the present submission may be useful to the Senate Committee on Immigration, as a reasonably accurate expression of municipal opinion on the matter of an immigration policy for Canada, in so far as it has been possible to get such expression of opinion in the short time available and without full conference discussion.

Montreal, May 30, 1947

CANADIAN FEDERATION OF  
MAYORS AND MUNICIPALITIES  
Mount Royal Hotel  
Montreal.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mayor Lewis, I do not think that makes clear just how many were opposed to immigration. There were those who did not endorse this resolution, but for various reasons. Did you take out of the statements of those not endorsing the number of those who were opposed?

Mr. LEWIS: No, I do not think that was analysed as finely as that, Senator Roebuck. In my own city, for instance, when that resolution was placed on the Board of Control agenda we took the stand, rightly or wrongly, that this was a matter for the Dominion Government, and that too often municipal governments are accused, rightly or wrongly, of interfering in dominion or provincial government business, which is primarily the duty of those respective governments. I think we are on fairly solid ground on that, because too often our municipal agenda is loaded with stuff which is not municipal. I am a great believer that where a senior government is elected by the people of this country, and conditions are such as we see in Europe and in Canada, it is for that government to move fast or otherwise in the solution of that problem.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: But it would be a grave mistake to place you in the position of being opposed to this resolution because you did not endorse it.

Mr. LEWIS: I think so. But at the same time we try to give an honest breakdown, Senator. You will agree with that.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, yes, but I do not want any misunderstanding to go from this Committee, that all those who did not endorse it, your Board included, are to be placed in the category of being in any way opposed to the substance of the resolution. They simply did not express themselves?

Mr. LEWIS: Right.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What we were discussing before you came in was the particular problem of the displaced people, which is right on our doorstep. I do not know whether you heard Miss Hayward this morning or not, but she



has been over there, and she has told us of the plight of these people and of our responsibility as Canadians. As senators, we have been discussing this thing for two years, and we cannot get anywhere. As Canadians here this morning, Miss Hayward has put it to us from the humanitarian standpoint that we should do something, accept our responsibility as a nation, as a country of the world. What is your opinion, as a Canadian?

Mr. LEWIS: As a Canadian, I think it is long overdue, that we should have been on this job long ago. That is my opinion as a Canadian. I see as a Canadian other countries opening up their ports, and getting great publicity for it, in bringing in these displaced persons; and surely, remembering our boys and girls whose bodies were left in Europe, we are entitled to go further and bring these people to this country. As to the attitude of labour organizations, because in bringing in displaced persons it must be remembered that many of them will be mechanics and workers of other types, the matter of whether labour will be receptive would be for your committee to decide.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We have had them here, and they are not opposed to immigration. They say that they are opposed to using immigration as a means of bringing cheap labour into this country for the purpose of lowering the standard of living.

Mr. LEWIS: I agree.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And there is not anybody in the committee who does not agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN: We are much obliged, Mr. Lewis.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is the program.

The CHAIRMAN: I ought to say this to the committee, that the next meeting, on account of all of us desiring to meet the President of the United States, will not be held here next Wednesday, but we shall meet again on Thursday next.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: In the meantime there is this matter of doing something about this urgent problem. Are we going to do anything, or are we going to let it slide down for another eight days?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that Senator Wilson did something that maybe I should have done. I was appointed on that committee, but I thought that the Prime Minister might take advice better from a lady on the committee, and so I had Senator Wilson substitute for me. She wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. Possibly she can tell you now what is the result.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I had first a message from the Prime Minister's office. Then I met him, and he said he thought that his pronouncement the previous day would have been an answer, but, he said, "Are you not satisfied?" I said, "I am afraid I have been working too long at this to be satisfied". "Well," he said, "I am very hard pressed; I do not feel I can receive a deputation now. Will you see some of the others?" He suggested Mr. Claxton. I knew that Mr. Claxton had always endeavoured to help us in the past, and I did not think he needed to be urged, but I am afraid it dropped there, and I do not know that we can once more make an appeal to the Cabinet to take more prompt action. We might ask them to enlarge their "relatives" definition to take in all. I think we have urged that before, have we not, Senator Roebuck?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, yes, we have. That does not get us very far. What I want to do is to bring those over within the present classification, and then enlarge.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: But we have brought in two groups, not three. Fifty to one hundred people. It is pathetic. I think Miss Hayward probably told you that when she visited the camps there was great jubilation because these



Canadian teams had arrived in one or two instances, but there were so few eligible in that very limited category, and that was the reason for the small group coming first. There was accommodation available for more at that time, but that was all they had been able to cover thoroughly according to the Order in Council. Since then it has been enlarged, but not enough to satisfy anyone, yet.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Mr. Howe is acting Minister of Immigration. Is there any way of getting it from Mr. Howe? He generally does things.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think that with Mr. Howe and his present Deputy we might perhaps get somewhere.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Let us appoint a sub-committee to meet Mr. Howe.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: I think the same committee might consider meeting Mr. Howe, and probably the Minister of Labour and he might be very helpful to us.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I feel that that is the proper thing to do. I do not think it is right to pester the Prime Minister. What we have to do is to go and get the ships and see that the Immigration officers get on the job and bring these people over here. It is enterprise that we want more than policy.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: It is a little bit more than that. I do not know how many people would be eligible to come under the existing orders in council.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think Senator Crerar can speak more authoritatively than I can on this question, but the Department of Immigration is having great difficulty in locating the number of individuals they are looking for in Europe. Mr. Joliffe tells me that in some cases the relatives here have not given the correct last addresses. They said, "Oh, we thought you would know". That sort of thing has caused delays, and there are not nearly the number available in a certain area that can be reached.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, the representative of the inter-governmental committee happens to be in the room. Perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. COLLEY: I can only say the same as Senator Wilson. We are working on this as fast as we can. Arrangements have been made to bring these people over here on any steamer that can be found available, but finding these people is quite a job in itself. I had a list in the other day of many people who were found to be ineligible for some reason or other. It is a matter of whether it is physically possible to get these people under the present circumstances. To get the 150 people sorted out and to get this other crowd, it took much time because they probably examined two or three times as many people as they were looking for. In many cases the addresses given on the Forms 55 that were sent overseas were not the present addresses.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Have you any idea of how many of these people, approximately a million, could be admitted to Canada under the existing order in council?

Mr. COLLEY: I should make a rough guess of say, 5,000.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is the point I am getting at. If you can get 5,000 people that is a very helpful thing in a limited way, but if we are going to deal with this problem along the lines that Miss Hayward suggests, and which I think carries the judgment of the committee very largely, then what is needed is a definite change in government policy to the entire problem.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Would not an order in council allow ten or twenty thousand people if it so stated?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: No.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: What about the organization that this gentleman speaks about? Why is it that they can only find 150 after being in Europe for a long time. I think I could find 150. What I am trying to get across is that you are looking for flaws and reasons, and I think an order in council could be given to-morrow to allow ten or twenty thousand good, healthy, respectable people to come in.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Would the honourable senator tell the committee how you can get an order in council?

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: You should know that.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: It goes back to what I was saying a while ago. If in the existing orders in council we can bring in, as this gentleman tells us, 5,000 from nearly a million people . . . .

Mr. COLLEY: I meant 5,000 out of the master list of displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: How many were in that list?

Mr. COLLEY: I believe 5,900.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: About 50 per cent.

Mr. COLLEY: On that list there are a large number of people who are classified as alien enemies at the present time, and, as far as the inter-governmental committee are concerned, they are out. A large number of people who are classified as people of German origin are specifically to be eliminated. So it will boil down to about two-thirds of those on the list would only be the concern of IRO or IGCR. In the other group there are plenty who have not relatives here; they run into many thousands; and if there were a blanket order available to bring in people, and for the committee to work on at any time at their convenience when they could get the ships, that would make things very much easier for all concerned.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Do you not think that your job is to find out and to be sure to get the ships?

Mr. COLLEY: That is what we are trying to do.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Well, I told the committee last week, and I repeat now, that there are Liberty ships in New York Harbour that you could charter. If somebody would be authorized to go and confirm that, he could come here and say that you can get a ship to make that trip.

The CHAIRMAN: Senator Roebuck, is there anything further?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The inter-governmental committee can charter a ship as ships are available if we will enlarge our classes to come here. They cannot get a ship for fifty people. We would have to be prepared to take large numbers.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I have a case of only one living relative of people in Canada. All I know is that all her family is wiped out, and she is the only living relative in Europe. She has here a sister and cousins who will take her. I have not yet written about this case, but I am going to do so to-day or to-morrow. That lady should be allowed in here. She is only about 35 years old. Her child and her husband were killed.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Supposing Senator Hushion would write to the Immigration Department to-morrow—

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I am going to.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Give them the particulars of the case, and get a reply, as probably you will, that this person is not admissible under the regulations.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Well, I do not know any reason why she should not be.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That may be, but it comes back, after all, to the matter which I mentioned a moment ago, that you have got to have a change and an enlargement of government policy.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Could not this committee say that we have enough information and that they ought to be able to put their fingers on five thousand, or a thousand, or whatever a boatload is, or the capacity of several boats, making a few trips, to allow this number in when the facts are substantiated as to who they are and what relatives they have here, and that they are not likely to be a public charge. We shall be closing in a few weeks, and we may not be here again until next year.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: We had better wait for Mr. Howe.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Is it fair to put that question to Mr. Howe, who is only acting minister?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: But he is to get an order in council to broaden the scope.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And he can get it.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any further suggestions?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I think the suggestion is that we go down to see Mr. Howe. Everyone here should come as well.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. You arrange a date and place.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything further to bring up? If not, we will adjourn until Thursday, the 12th day of June.

## APPENDIX "A"

## TOTAL NUMBER OF DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES IN GERMANY AND AUSTRIA AS OF MARCH 1947

Nationality	Austria	Germany	Total
German and Austrian.....	400		400
Poles.....	10,900	249,600	260,500
Balts.....	3,600	187,400	191,000
Yugoslavs.....	34,200	30,200	64,400
Jews.....	33,900	167,900	201,800
Stateless.....	18,400	12,400	30,800
Others.....	30,100	178,500	208,600
TOTAL.....	131,500	826,000	957,500

## DISPLACED PERSONS RECEIVING UNRRA ASSISTANCE, CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATION AND BY SEX (SUMMER 1946)

	Male	Female	Total
CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE			
Architects.....	635	29	664
Bricklayers.....	1,808	17	1,825
Carpenters.....	5,569	49	5,618
Construction machine operators.....	220	13	233
Central heat maintenance men, installers and repair men.....	404	15	419
Dredgemen.....	68	nil	68
Draughtsmen.....	588	172	760
Electricians.....	3,467	48	3,515
Engine men, operating.....	340	15	355
Glaziers.....	371	14	385
Masons.....	830	12	842
Powdermen and Blasters.....	83	6	89
Painters (interior, exterior, sign spray).....	1,669	63	1,732
Plumbers and steamfitters.....	530	3	533
Riggers.....	152	2	154
Riveters.....	95	10	105
Saw mill operators.....	399	6	405
Steelworkers.....	442	132	574
Surveyors.....	464	10	474
All other.....	2,203	311	2,514
Sub total.....	20,337	927	21,264
AGRICULTURE—FORESTRY, DIARY, FOOD PROCESSING			
Farmers.....	53,707	23,724	77,431
Lumbermen.....	694	11	705
Trappers, hunters and fishermen.....	710	15	725
Millers.....	1,120	29	1,149
All other.....	5,716	4,467	10,183
Sub total.....	61,947	28,246	90,193



DISPLACED PERSONS RECEIVING UNRRA ASSISTANCE, CLASSIFIED BY  
OCCUPATION AND BY SEX (SUMMER 1946)

	Male	Female	Total
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE: CLERICAL AND COMMERCIAL</b>			
Accountants, auditor and book-keepers.....	4,516	2,577	7,093
Business men: Managers and Executives.....	4,514	744	5,258
Cleks (general—file—postal).....	7,139	7,931	15,070
Salesmen.....	4,956	3,630	8,586
Office Machine Operators.....	206	250	456
Office Managers.....	816	208	1,024
Stenographers.....	56	256	312
Translators and Interpreters.....	341	678	1,019
Typists.....	178	1,367	1,545
All other.....	996	690	1,686
Sub total.....	23,718	18,331	42,049
<b>MINING, CHEMICALS AND PROCESSING</b>			
Ceramic workers.....	202	106	308
Glass workers and blowers.....	264	77	341
Miners (hand and power).....	850	98	948
Petroleum workers.....	136	13	149
Steel puddlers and furnace men.....	414	136	550
Quarrymen and stone cutters.....	245	33	278
All other.....	532	429	961
Sub total.....	2,643	892	3,535
<b>HEALTH AND SANITATION</b>			
Dentists, Dental technicians and mechanics.....	567	642	1,209
Dieticians.....	16	50	66
Hospital attendants and orderlies.....	343	796	1,139
Midwives.....	12	500	512
Nurses (registered, practical; in training).....	199	3,891	4,090
Optometrists.....	25	47	72
Ophthalmologists.....	26	20	46
Pediatricians.....	59	88	147
Physical therapists.....	127	109	236
Physicians and Surgeons.....	1,348	439	1,787
Pharmacists.....	407	571	978
Sanitary engineers, and technicians.....	117	50	167
Veterinarians.....	369	30	399
X-Ray Technicians.....	33	37	70
All other.....	391	573	964
Sub total.....	4,039	7,843	11,882
<b>COMMUNICATIONS: TRANSPORTATION AND SUPPLY</b>			
Airplane mechanics.....	496	26	522
Airplane Pilots.....	220	7	227
Auto and Truck mechanics.....	4,489	45	4,534
Auto and truck body repair men.....	1,788	37	1,825
Drivers of light and heavy trucks.....	10,377	178	10,555
Craters and packers.....	215	80	295
Installers and repairmen, telephone and telegraph linemen.....	617	27	644
Linemen.....	245	2	247
Radio Operators.....	211	6	217
Radio Repairmen.....	696	25	721
Railway workers (engineers, mechanics, switchmen, brakemen, conductors).....	2,797	89	2,886
Seamen.....	969	16	985
Teamsters.....	222	9	231
Telegraph Operators.....	208	168	376
Telephone Operators.....	219	536	755
Teletype Operators.....	89	25	114
Tire rebuilders.....	83	7	90
Warehousemen.....	765	115	880
All other.....	1,691	198	1,889
Sub total.....	26,397	1,596	27,993

DISPLACED PERSONS RECEIVING UNRRA ASSISTANCE, CLASSIFIED BY  
OCCUPATION AND BY SEX (SUMMER 1946)—*Con.*

	Male	Female	Total
<b>SPECIAL SERVICES</b>			
Bakers.....	3,299	190	3,489
Barbers and Hairdressers.....	1,980	929	2,909
Blacksmiths.....	1,982	18	2,000
Bookbinders.....	274	85	359
Butchers.....	3,587	82	3,669
Cooks.....	1,247	2,442	3,689
Firefighters.....	178	32	210
Gardeners.....	1,990	654	2,664
Housekeepers and domestics.....	384	21,782	22,166
Jewellers.....	208	46	254
Kitchen workers.....	388	2,479	2,867
Laundry (Machine and Hand).....	63	316	379
Linotype operators.....	168	40	208
Locksmiths.....	8,342	68	8,410
Opticians.....	85	10	95
Photographers.....	629	198	827
Piano tuners.....	37	6	43
Policemen and guards.....	2,070	33	2,103
Pressmen.....	189	43	232
Printers.....	480	77	557
Projectionists.....	231	23	254
Shoemakers and repairmen; saddlers and harness makers.....	9,057	539	9,596
Tailors and seamstresses.....	7,218	15,571	22,789
Undertakers.....	49	10	59
Upholsterers.....	361	40	401
Waiters.....	698	1,225	1,923
Watch repairmen.....	868	135	1,003
All other.....	4,323	5,050	9,373
Sub total.....	50,385	52,123	102,508
<b>PROFESSIONAL AND ARTS (OTHER THAN HEALTH AND SANITATION)</b>			
Agronomists.....	3,692	1,754	5,446
Artists and Sculptors.....	807	329	1,136
Athletic Instructors.....	270	144	414
Clergymen.....	1,335	22	1,357
Chemists.....	623	227	850
Child care workers.....	82	603	685
Engineers—civil.....	1,230	31	1,261
Engineers—electrical.....	640	45	685
Engineers—industrial.....	462	26	488
Engineers—mechanical.....	828	15	843
Engineers—mining.....	207	15	222
Entertainers, actors, singers and dancers.....	944	1,047	1,991
Lawyers.....	1,466	147	1,613
Librarians.....	96	116	212
Musicians.....	1,363	372	1,735
Recreation leaders.....	89	77	166
Social workers.....	68	66	134
Teachers and professors—academic.....	3,408	3,980	7,388
Teachers of arts and crafts.....	440	534	974
Teachers and professors—technical.....	372	335	707
Occupational counsellors and interviewers.....	33	10	43
Writers, reporters, authors and advertising men.....	618	121	739
All other.....	2,336	1,119	3,455
Sub total.....	21,409	11,135	32,544
<b>METAL TRADES</b>			
Electroplaters.....	82	9	91
Foundrymen.....	330	18	348
Forgemen.....	499	7	506
Heat Treaters.....	140	10	150
Machine Operators.....	1,555	178	1,734
Machinists.....	1,153	156	1,309
Metalsmiths.....	853	38	891
Millwrights.....	225	7	232
Welders.....	779	81	860
Toolmakers.....	287	14	301
All other.....	874	328	1,202
Sub total.....	6,778	846	7,624

DISPLACED PERSONS RECEIVING UNRRA ASSISTANCE, CLASSIFIED BY  
OCCUPATION AND BY SEX (SUMMER 1946)—*Conc.*

	Male	Female	Total
MISCELLANEOUS PROCESSING			
Clothing machine workers.....	588	1,185	1,773
Coopers.....	150	11	161
Leather workers.....	812	133	945
Paper workers.....	177	86	261
Rubber workers.....	126	80	206
Power plant installers.....	73	33	106
Textile workers.....	2,220	2,028	4,248
Woodworkers.....	3,004	115	3,119
All other.....	2,949	2,766	5,715
Sub Total.....	10,097	6,437	16,534
GRAND TOTAL.....	227,750	128,376	356,126

















Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada Immigration and Labour  
in Winnipeg, 1947

1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

# Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 11

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

---

### WITNESSES

Mr. A. Hlynka, M.P.

Mr. Jaroslaw William Arsenych, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Secretary of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

Mr. Eustace Wasylyshen, Winnipeg, Manitoba, a member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

Very Reverend Dr. Basil Kushnir, Winnipeg, Manitoba, President of Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

Mr. Alex Skelton, Director General of Economic Research, Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.F.S.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

---

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C. Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horne	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,

*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, 12th June, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock,—Chairman, Buchanan, Burchill, Crerar, Euler, Horner, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Robinson, Taylor and Wilson—13.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Honourable Senator Wilson read into the record a Resolution of the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada, urging the Government of Canada to admit to Canada displaced persons of Europe.

Mr. A. Hlynka, M.P., was heard in introduction of the Ukrainian delegation attending before the Committee to-day, and made a statement on his recent visit to refugee camps of Europe.

Mr. Jaroslaw William Arsenych, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Secretary of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, appeared and read a brief on Immigration to Canada from Ukrainian group of refugees of Europe and a History of the Ukrainian Population of Canada, submitted on behalf of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, and was questioned.

Mr. Eustace Wasylyshen, Winnipeg, Manitoba, a member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, was heard with respect to immigration to Canada of Ukrainian people of Bukowina.

Very Reverend Dr. Basil Kushnir, Winnipeg, Manitoba, President of Ukrainian Canadian Committee, was heard in support of immigration to Canada of refugees of Europe.

Mr. Alex Skelton, Director General of Economic Research, Department of Reconstruction and Supply, appeared and read a brief on Immigration and Industrial Development in Canada, and was questioned.

The Honourable Senator Hushion read into the record a statement with respect to ships available in the United States which are suitable for carrying immigrants to Canada.

At 1 o'clock, p.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday next, 18th June, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.

*Attest.*

H. ARMSTRONG,

*Clerk of the Committee.*



## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

THURSDAY, June 12, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: While we are waiting for some members to arrive may I call on Senator Wilson who has some documents she wishes to put on the record.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Senator Murdock, I received a letter from the National Council of Jewish Women, advising me that they had sent some resolutions to the Chairman of the Immigration Committee. I asked Senator Murdock if he would be good enough to allow me to read the resolutions. I have worked with the National Council of Jewish Women, and have a high regard for the work they are doing. For this reason I should like to present the resolutions.

Whereas The National Council of Jewish Women of Canada and its thirteen affiliated Sections across Canada are profoundly sensible of the tragic plight of the displaced persons in Europe, and realizing the hopelessness and frustration inevitably resulting from so long a delay in resettlement, have observed with satisfaction the sincere effort on the part of the Government of Canada to broaden and liberalize immigration regulations, and having been apprised of the statement in connection therewith made by The Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada in the House of Commons on the first day of May last;

Therefore respectfully urge the Government of Canada to make special provision for the admission of displaced persons on a broader and more humanitarian basis than would be normally included in the general immigration regulations, and in such connection respectfully submit:

(a) That subject to all necessary guarantees and safeguards, persons domiciled in Canada be permitted to bring to Canada any displaced person related to the person so domiciled in Canada without regard to the degree of such relationship;

(b) That the Government of Canada should offer asylum to a reasonable number of such displaced persons and their families selected from each of the occupational categories prepared by UNRRA.

LUCILLE LORIE.

(Mrs. Harold Lorie.)

The same resolution has been presented by thirteen sections of the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada from Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Quebec, Regina, Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Saskatoon, Fort William, Hamilton, Welland and Montreal.

The CHAIRMAN: Should we print them all?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It is the same resolution presented by each section, so they need only be listed. The resolution is framed along the line that the Canadian National Committee on Refugees has advocated.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Hlynka.



Mr. A. HLYNKA, M.P.: Mr. Chairman, and honourable gentlemen of the committee, it was my privilege last year to introduce to you the Ukrainian Canadian Delegation which presented their brief on May 29, 1946. It is my privilege again to introduce to you a delegation from the same committee, which will make their presentation to-day.

I pointed out last year that the Ukrainian Canadian Committee is a co-ordinating committee of six nation-wide Canadian organizations which embrace about 80 per cent of the organized Canadians of Ukrainian origin. The six organizations represented in the Ukrainian Canadian Committee are:

1. The Ukrainian Canadian Veterans' Association, which is a member of the Canadian Legion and of the British Empire Service League.
2. The Brotherhood of Ukrainian Catholics of Canada.
3. The Ukrainian Self-Reliance League.
4. Ukrainian National Federation.
5. The United Hetman Organizations, and
6. The League of Ukrainian Labour Organizations.

The members of the delegation who will present the brief to you to-day are: Very Reverend Dr. Basil Kushnir, whom you have met before. Dr. Kushnir is Chancellor of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese in Canada and is President of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. He heads the delegation.

The second member of the delegation is Mr. Eustace Wasylyshen, a Winnipeg businessman and a member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee. Mr. Wasylyshen was a member of the Foreign Department on Immigration for the Cunard White Star Line for Western Canada for fourteen years.

The third member of the delegation is Mr. Jaroslaw William Arsenych, K.C., a Winnipeg barrister, who has practised law in Winnipeg for the past thirty years. Mr. Arsenych is Secretary of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and will present the brief.

I have not had time to read the brief, as I received a copy of it only last night, but it is quite lengthy and it may perhaps be advisable to have it printed as an appendix to the proceedings; but Mr. Arsenych will touch on the salient points in the brief and comment on the various sections of it. Should honourable members of the committee care to ask questions they may do so while Mr. Arsenych is reviewing the brief and also at the end of his presentation. I know that members of the delegation will be only too glad to reply to questions asked. If there is time, I am sure Mr. Wasylyshen and the Very Reverend Dr. Kushnir would be glad to say a few words.

Before I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call upon Mr. Arsenych to present the brief, I should like to say just a word in expressing my personal appreciation of the work of this committee. It is my opinion, and I have stated it on many occasions in various cities where I have spoken, that the Senate Committee on Immigration and Labour has done perhaps more than anybody else in Canada for immigration. I quite agree with the Honourable Senator Roebuck when he stated on March 26th last, that:

The committee did a great job last session and undoubtedly had a very great effect on public opinion, and I rather expect, also on official action. There have been two revisions of the regulations since our committee was appointed at the last session, and there seems to be an impression abroad that another revision will be made.

And another revision has been made. I should like to quote further from page 7 of the proceedings on March 26 where the Honourable Mr. Burchill had this to say:

... the only way we can get the government to act is through publicity, and through public opinion. From our experience of last year, it would seem that any suggestions we make would have no effect on the department, and we should consider that we have to get publicity and public opinion behind us before we can get the government to do anything.

The Honourable Mr. Roebuck followed with these words:

If one will observe the newspaper reports of what took place in this committee, one must come to the conclusion that public opinion was vastly influenced by what we did, and I do not think the effect of what we did has run out yet. There is still something by way of residue to come from our work.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I should like personally to support that statement and express my view and satisfaction that your committee has done excellent work. I for one have referred to the statistics published in your reports issued so far, and they are most valuable. There are few members of Parliament who have the time to study every subject that they come in contact with, unless it is presented to them in a concise manner in a publication such as this. Personally I am very grateful to your committee, Mr. Chairman, for the work it has done thus far, and it is my opinion that even though the regulations have been relaxed somewhat, or amended, that there is still a lot to be done. Your committee will no doubt continue its sittings and I know that this year will add to your credit of what you have done before.

Mr. Chairman, if you would ask Mr. Arsenych to present his brief now, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps before I call upon Mr. Arsenych I should say that Senator Roebuck, as you may have heard over the radio, had to go to New York to speak to a committee in that city on the Jewish question, and cannot be present to-day.

Mr. J. W. ARSENYCH: Mr. Chairman, Honourable members of the committee: As our friend Mr. Hlynka has stated already, on the 29th day of May, 1946, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee presented to the Standing Committee of the Senate of Canada on Immigration and Labour a brief, which though of a general character, was nevertheless fairly exhaustive and all-embracing. (See *Hansard* No. 2 of Wednesday, 29th May, 1946).

Considering that the question of immigration to Canada still is and shall remain for many years to come to be of paramount importance to all Canadians; and that your Committee is continuing its labours in gathering facts and deliberating on such facts in regard to this all-important question of immigration, our Committee takes this further opportunity of supplementing its former brief by additional facts, based mostly on statistics taken from the 1941 census for the whole Dominion of Canada, and is inviting your Committee and those who are charged with the duty of formulating the immigration policy for Canada to draw their own conclusions from such facts and statistics.

There is no need to elaborate the fact that

- (a) Canada is possessed of great spaces and wealth in natural resources;
- (b) that we are occupying a favourable position in the world markets;
- (c) that we are enjoying a comparatively high standard of civilization, a sound form of government, stable institutions and traditions, in common with the Anglo-Saxon world; and lastly, but not of the least importance,
- (d) that we have unity of our peoples.

In this regard it is interesting to have a complete picture of Canada's population according to racial origin.

The 1941 census places the population of Canada at 11,506,655.

### NUMERICAL IMPORTANCE

The breakdown of this population in the standing order of numerical importance with percentages to the total population is as follows:

Numerical Importance	Racial Origin	Population	Percentage
1	French.....	3,483,038	30.27
2	English.....	2,968,402	25.80
3	Scottish.....	1,403,974	12.20
4	Irish.....	1,267,702	11.02
5	German.....	464,682	4.02
6	Ukrainian.....	305,929	2.66
7	Scandinavian.....	244,603	2.13
8	Netherland.....	212,863	1.85
9	Jewish.....	170,241	1.48
10	Polish.....	167,485	1.45
11	Indian and Eskimo.....	125,521	1.09
12	Italian.....	112,625	0.98
13	Russian.....	83,708	0.73
14	Hungarian.....	54,598	0.47
15	Czech and Slovak.....	42,912	0.37
16	Finnish.....	41,683	0.36
17	Austrian.....	37,715	0.33
18	Chinese.....	34,627	0.30
19	Belgian.....	29,711	0.26
20	Roumanian.....	24,689	0.21
21	Japanese.....	23,149	0.20
	Other British Isles Races.....	75,826	0.66
	Other European Races.....	50,482	0.44
	Other Asiatic Races.....	16,288	0.14
	All others.....	58,927	0.51
	Not stated.....	5,275	0.05
Total.....		11,506,655	100.00

It is evident that the French come first in numerical importance, the English second, the Scottish third, the Irish fourth, the Germans fifth, and the Ukrainians come sixth with a population of 305,929 which represents 2.66 per cent of the total Canadian population. When all the British Isles races are taken together, they have the greatest population, the French come second, Germans third, and the Ukrainians rank fourth.

Of all the Slavic races in Canada the Ukrainians are numerically the greatest. Their population is also greater than the combined populations of the Austrians, Belgians, Bulgarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Finns, Greeks, Hungarians, Icelanders, Lithuanians, Roumanians and Yugoslavs. It is also greater than that of the Russians, Poles and the Danes put together.

We have gone through two World Wars within the last twenty-five years and during the last war Canada's strength and unity withstood an unusually severe test.

Our men and women, descendents of warring nations, lived together in Canadian cities, settlements and hamlets without any untoward incident while their sons and daughters fought side by side in the Canadian armed forces.

We can safely plan the future of Canada on the solid fact that though her citizens are descended from very many racial origins, *we are united because of the very fact that our citizens came here from various lands in search of liberty and equal opportunities and sought refuge from oppression, discrimination, fear and uncertainty.*

Considering the question of immigration for Canada, it would be advisable first of all to take stock of our past experience and experiment in giving refuge in Canada to immigrants of various racial origins.



A thorough analysis of the figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was intended to, and will serve the very purpose. In our submission we are chiefly concerned with the Canadian citizens of Ukrainian origin, and we wish to give a true picture of the value and importance of this group as a component part of this great dominion.

We intend to deal exclusively with figures taken from the 1941 census for the Dominion of Canada. These statistics follow.

The Ukrainian population, according to provinces, as compared with the total population, is as follows:

	Total Canadian Population	Ukrainian Population		
		Male	Female	Total
Prince Edward Island.....	95,047		2	2
Nova Scotia.....	577,962	403	308	711
New Brunswick.....	457,401	14	8	22
Quebec.....	3,331,882	4,438	3,568	8,006
Ontario.....	3,767,655	26,766	21,392	48,158
Manitoba.....	729,744	46,862	42,900	89,762
Saskatchewan.....	895,992	42,159	37,618	79,777
Alberta.....	796,169	37,849	34,019	71,868
British Columbia.....	817,861	4,058	3,505	7,563
Yukon and N.W.T.....	16,942	51	9	60
Canada.....	11,506,655	162,600	143,329	305,929

Of the total Ukrainian population in Canada 78·9 per cent inhabit the three Prairie Provinces, where most of those reported gainfully occupied are found in agriculture.

### OCCUPATIONS

There are 113,921 Ukrainians, 14 years of age and over, gainfully occupied as follows:

Class of Occupation	Male	Female	Total
Agriculture.....	53,849	1,123	54,972
Fishing, Hunting, Trapping.....	197	1	198
Logging.....	1,520		1,520
Mining and Quarrying.....	2,904		2,904
Manufacturing.....	11,048	2,100	13,143
Construction.....	3,298	5	3,303
Transportation and Communication.....	6,675	47	6,722
Trade.....	3,508	955	4,463
Finance.....	104	5	109
Professional Service.....	1,478	905	2,383
Public Service.....	192	10	202
Recreational Service.....	230	13	243
Personal Service.....	3,300	9,221	12,521
Clerical.....	1,051	745	1,796
Labourers (not in agriculture, fishing, logging or mining).....	9,042	206	9,248
Not stated.....	166	23	189
All occupations (not including active service).....	98,562	15,359	113,921

Of the total Ukrainian population in Canada 37·24 per cent are reported as gainfully occupied as compared to 36·47 per cent of the entire population in Canada.



Hon. Mr. EULER: They are the hardest working people in the country! Eh?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would not say that. They were fortunate enough to have a little to do here and there.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I am not criticizing them.

Mr. ARSENYCH: The distribution by provinces and by sex is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
British Columbia.....	2,755	542	3,297
Alberta.....	21,732	2,494	24,226
Saskatchewan.....	24,070	2,568	26,638
Manitoba.....	28,141	5,185	33,326
Ontario.....	18,603	3,863	22,466
Quebec.....	3,011	695	3,706
New Brunswick.....	9	1	10
Nova Scotia.....	241	11	252
Total.....	98,562	15,359	113,921

Of the 192,008 Ukrainians reported as not gainfully occupied, 81,581 includes women over 14 years of age and 93,469 children up to 14 years of age. There were 16,228 men reported as 55 years of age or more, most of whom would not be gainfully occupied. Of the total population reported as gainfully occupied 73.90 per cent are in the three Prairie Provinces—a large proportion of which are in agriculture, 19.72 per cent are in Ontario—a large proportion of them being in manufacturing, personal service and labourers.

#### *Fishing, Hunting, Trapping:*

A total of 51,450 men and women of all Canadians are reported under this classification, including 197 men and 1 woman of Ukrainian origin, as follows:

Fishermen .....	123
Hunters, trappers, guides .....	75
Total .....	198

There are more in Manitoba under this heading than in all other provinces put together. The woman is listed as a "fisherman" in British Columbia.

#### *Logging:*

A total of 80,250 men and women of all nationalities are under this classification, including 1,520 men of Ukrainian origin, as follows:

Owners, managers .....	8
Foremen .....	8
Foresters and timber cruisers .....	8
Lumbermen .....	1,496
Total .....	1,520

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Excuse me, what do you mean by "lumbermen"?

Mr. ARSENYCH: That is to say, men employed in the lumber industry.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Employed in logging?

Mr. ARSENYCH: In the logging industry.

52.4 per cent of the population of Ukrainian origin gainfully occupied in this industry is in Ontario, 20.6 per cent in British Columbia.

*Agriculture*

48.25% of the Ukrainians reported as gainfully occupied are in agriculture, as follows:

Farmers and stockraisers.....	32,899
Farm foremen.....	50
Farm labourers.....	22,023
Total.....	54,972

48.25% of the Ukrainians reported as gainfully occupied are in agriculture, as compared with 25.82% of all the nationalities in Canada. The distribution by provinces is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
British Columbia.....	637	22	659
Alberta.....	16,027	299	16,326
Saskatchewan.....	18,760	364	19,124
Manitoba.....	16,168	353	16,521
Ontario.....	2,092	80	2,172
Quebec.....	144	5	149
New Brunswick.....	1		1
Nova Scotia.....	20		20
Total.....	53,849	1,123	54,972

Of those gainfully occupied in agriculture 94.58 per cent are in the three Prairie Provinces, 59.84 per cent are farmers or stock-raisers and 40.15 per cent are farm labourers. There are 835 female farmers and stock-raisers, and 288 farm labourers.

*Mining and Quarrying*

A total of 71,886 men and women of all Canadians are under this classification, including 2,904 men of Ukrainian origin, as follows:

Owners, managers .....	10
Foremen .....	18
Labourers—mines and quarries .....	460
Miners and millmen .....	2,381
Oil well drillers .....	2
Quarries and rock drillers .....	33
Total .....	2,904

73.2 per cent of the population of Ukrainian origin gainfully occupied in this industry is in Alberta and Ontario, 82 per cent are miners and millmen.

*Manufacturing*

Only such persons as follows the so-called "processing" occupations, that is, occupations in which they are directly engaged in the process of manufacture or repair, are included in the group "Manufacturing", and all persons following such occupations are classified in this group, irrespective of whether they are employed by manufacturing firms or by mining, construction, transportation, etc., companies at the time of the taking of the census.

13,148 or 11.54 per cent of the population of Ukrainian origin reported as gainfully occupied is in manufacturing in the following occupations:

	Male	Female	Total
Owners, managers.....	121		121
Foremen.....	103	9	112
Inspectors—chemicals.....	3		3
Inspectors and gaugers—metal.....	88	27	115
Inspectors, graders—wood.....	28	1	29
Bakers.....	305	16	321
Blacksmiths, forgemen.....	495		495
Bleachers, dyers—textiles.....	21	1	22
Boiler firemen.....	151		151
Boilermakers, platters, riveters.....	281	30	311
Bookbinders.....	5	8	13
Boot and shoe repairers.....	630	3	633
Butchers and meat cutters.....	461	9	470
Cabinet and furniture makers.....	82		82
Coopers.....	13		13
Dressmakers and sewers, not in factory.....	1	114	115
Electrical appliance repairmen.....	41		41
Engravers and lithographers.....	15	1	16
Files and grinders.....	164	5	169
Fitters and assemblers—metal.....	265	23	288
Furnacemen—metal.....	296		291
Furriers.....	137	54	196
Heat treaters and annealers.....	14		14
Jewellers and watchmakers.....	53	3	56
Machinists—metal.....	525		525
Mechanics and repairmen, not elsewhere specified.....	1,181	2	1,183
Millers—flour and grain.....	59		59
Milliners—not in factory.....		1	1
Loom fixers.....	1		1
Millwrights.....	47		47
Moulders, coremakers, casters.....	465	7	472
Paper makers.....	34		34
Patternmakers.....	10	1	11
Photographers.....	35	3	38
Polishers and buffers—metal.....	66	7	73
Power station operators.....	6		6
Printers.....	105	6	111
Rolling mill operators, not elsewhere specified.....	30		30
Sawyers—wood.....	133		133
Sheet metal workers, tinsmiths.....	217	2	219
Spinners, twisters—textiles.....	27	39	66
Stationary enginemen.....	319		319
Stonecutters and dressers.....	16		16
Tailors.....	330	38	368
Toolmakers, die cutters.....	73		73
Upholsterers.....	67	3	70
Weavers—textiles.....	13	18	31
Welders and flame cutters.....	326	8	334
Wood turners, planers, etc.....	37	2	39
OTHER OCCUPATIONS IN MANUFACTURING:			
Chemical products.....	110	9	119
Clothing and textile products.....	355	1,077	1,432
Food products.....	131	129	440
Leather products.....	259	80	339
Liquor and beverages.....	80	2	82
Metal products.....	1,326	126	1,452
Non-Metallic mineral products.....	95	11	106
Printing and photography.....	10	8	18
Rubber products.....	74	40	114
Tobacco products.....	7	69	76
Wood and paper products.....	409	54	463
Other products.....	117	54	171
Total.....	11,048	2,100	13,148

73.9 per cent of the above men and women gainfully occupied in manufacturing are in Manitoba and Ontario, 57.54 per cent are mechanics, repairmen, metal machinists, blacksmiths, forgemen, butchers, meat cutters, moulders, coremakers, casters, boot and shoemakers, or are employed in clothing, textile, metal, food, wood and paper products.

*Construction*

This heading includes those persons who are following construction trades regardless of the industries in which they are employed.

A total of 202,848 men and women of all Canadians are reported as gainfully occupied in construction, of which 3,303 are of Ukrainian origin, as follows:

Owners, managers.....	45
Foremen.....	24
Inspectors.....	1
Brick and stone masons.....	70
Carpenters.....	2,014
Electricians and wiremen.....	105
Painters, decorators, glaziers.....	560
Plasterers and lathers.....	93
Plumbers and pipefitters.....	182
Structural iron workers.....	41
Other construction occupations.....	163
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,303</b>

37·10 per cent of those Ukrainian Canadians who are gainfully occupied in construction are in Manitoba and 33·09 per cent are in Ontario. Included in the above are 5 women in Ontario listed under the heading of "Painters, decorators, glaziers". 60·9 per cent of those in the industry are carpenters.

*Transportation and Communication*

This heading includes those persons who are following transport occupations regardless of the industries in which they are employed.

There are 6,675 men and 47 women of Ukrainian origin in this industry, as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Owners, managers.....	58	1	59
Foremen.....	78		78
Inspectors.....	13		13
Agents—ticket, station.....	9		9
Aviators—not in armed forces.....	8		8
Baggagemen and expressmen.....	5		5
Brakemen—railway.....	31		31
Bus drivers.....	15		15
Captains, mates, pilots.....	5		5
Chauffeurs and taxi drivers.....	98		98
Conductors—steam railway.....	1		1
Deliverymen and drivers, not elsewhere stated.....	1		1
Dispatchers—train.....	6		6
Engineering officers—on ships.....	7		7
Firemen and trimmers—on ships.....	46		46
Linemen and cablemen.....	18		18
Lockkeepers, canalmen, boatmen.....	21		21
Locomotive firemen.....	60		60
Longshoremen and stevedores.....	105		105
Messengers.....	143	1	144
Radio announcers.....	2		2
Radio station operators.....	6		6
Seamen—not elsewhere stated.....	47		47
Sectionmen and trackmen.....	3,902		3,902
Operators—electric railway.....	14		14
Switchmen, signalmen.....	85		85
Teamsters and carriage drivers.....	319	1	320
Telegraph operators.....	11	1	12
Truck drivers.....	1,373	4	1,377
Yardmen—railway, not elsewhere stated.....	92		92
Other transport occupations.....	54	1	55
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,675</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>6,722</b>

5,279 or 78·53 per cent of those in transportation and communication are *sectionmen, trackmen and truck drivers*.

*Trade*

A total of 3,508 men and 955 women of Ukrainian origin are in this classification, as follows:



	Male	Female	Total
Owners, managers—retail.....	1,857	125	1,982
Owners, managers—wholesale.....	83		83
Floorwalkers and foremen.....	12	3	15
Advertising agents.....	4		4
Auctioneers and appraisers.....	2		2
Brokers and agents, not elsewhere stated.....	11		11
Collectors—bills.....	6		6
Commercial travellers.....	73		73
Hawkers and pedlars.....	102		102
Inspectors, graders.....	59	46	105
Window decorators.....	3	3	6
Newsboys.....	17	1	18
Packers, wrappers.....	173	198	371
Purchasing agents and buyers.....	219	2	221
Canvassers and demonstrators.....	47	5	52
Sales persons in stores.....	835	569	1,404
Other trade occupations.....	5	3	8
Total.....	3,508	955	4,463

46·27 per cent of those under this heading are owners or managers in either wholesale or retail business and 39·77 per cent are packers, wrappers and sales-people in stores. Manitoba leads in the number of persons of this group in trade occupations, with Ontario in the second place.

#### Finance

A total of 109 are in finance occupations, as follows:

Owners, managers.....	8
Insurance agents.....	53
Real estate agents and dealers.....	46
Stock and bond dealers.....	2
Total.....	109

There are five women in the above group reported as real estate agents and dealers: one in British Columbia, three in Alberta and one in Manitoba.

#### Professional Service

1,478 men and 905 women of Ukrainian origin are in professional service, as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Architects.....	6		6
Artists and art teachers.....	15	8	23
Authors, editors, journalists.....	25	1	26
Chemists and metallurgists.....	46	3	49
Clergymen and priests.....	205		205
Dentists.....	12		12
Draftsmen and designers.....	28		28
Engineers—civil.....	17		17
Engineers—mechanical.....	21		21
Engineers—mining.....	14		14
Engineers—electrical.....	20		20
Lawyers and notaries.....	38		38
Librarians.....	2	2	4
Musicians and music teachers.....	100	16	116
Brothers and Nuns, not otherwise specified.....	25	53	78
Nurses—graduate.....	3	105	108
Nurses in training.....		126	126
Osteopaths and chiropractors.....	2		2
Physicians and surgeons.....	57	2	59
Professors, college principals.....	5		5
Religious workers, not elsewhere stated.....	7	8	15
Social welfare workers, not elsewhere stated.....	2	10	12
Teachers—school.....	760	553	1,313
Veterinary surgeons.....	3		3
Other professional occupations.....	65	18	83
Total.....	1,478	905	2,383

81.41 per cent of those rendering professional services in the above group are in the three Prairie Provinces. 55.09 per cent rendering professional services are school teachers. Alberta leads in the number of school teachers with 457, Saskatchewan comes next with 425, and Manitoba ranks third with 357.

Manitoba leads all the other provinces in the number of authors, editors and journalists, musicians and music teachers, lawyers, notaries—public, and social welfare workers. Ontario leads in the number of artists and art teachers, chemists and metallurgists, dentists, draughtsmen, and designers, civil, electrical, mechanical and mining engineers. Alberta leads in the number of clergymen, priests, brothers, nuns, graduate nurses, physicians and surgeons.

Hon. Mr. GERSHAW: Are those professional people all trained in Canada?

Mr. ARSENYCH: They were all trained in Canada. They were all raised and educated in Canada.

### *Public Service*

202 persons of Ukrainian origin are gainfully occupied under this heading, as follows:

Firemen—fire department.....	9
Policemen and detectives.....	53
Postmasters.....	36
Postmen and mail carriers.....	32
Public service officials.....	56
Other public occupations.....	16
Total.....	202

Manitoba leads in the number of firemen, policemen and detectives, postmen and mail carriers. Saskatchewan leads in the number of postmasters and public service officials. Included in the above are 8 female postmasters and 2 female public service officials.

### *Recreational Service*

A total of 243 persons of Ukrainian origin are engaged in recreational service as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Owners, managers.....	142		142
Actors, sportsmen.....	22	5	27
Motion picture projectionists.....	20		20
Ushers.....	13	8	21
Other recreational occupations.....	33		33
Total.....	230	13	243

58.43 per cent under this classification are owners and managers.

*Personal Service*

There are 3,300 men and 9,221 women of Ukrainian origin rendering personal services in the following occupations:

	Male	Female	Total
Owners, managers—Hotels.....	105	10	115
Owners, managers—Laundries.....	11	5	16
Owners, managers—Restaurants.....	160	42	202
Barbers, hairdressers.....	423	269	692
Bootblacks.....	19		19
Charworkers and cleaners.....	139	62	201
Cleaners and dyers.....	92	86	178
Cooks.....	673	267	940
Domestic servants, not elsewhere stated.....	357	4,792	5,149
Elevator tenders.....	37	7	44
Guards and caretakers, not elsewhere stated.....	194	1	195
Housekeepers, stewards, matrons.....	25	1,076	1,101
Janitors and sextons.....	252	13	270
Laundrymen.....	76	392	468
Lodging housekeepers.....	70	581	651
Nurses—practical.....	29	62	91
Waiters and waitresses.....	497	1,534	2,031
Undertakers.....	4		4
Porters.....	110	1	111
Other personal occupations.....	27	16	43
Total.....	3,300	9,221	12,521

57·34 per cent giving personal service are domestic servants and waitresses. There are 333 owners or managers of hotels, laundries and restaurants, Ontario having the greatest number. Alberta leads in the number of practical nurses.

*Clerical*

There are 1,796 men and women of Ukrainian origin in clerical occupations, as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Accountants and auditors.....	43	4	47
Bookkeepers and cashiers.....	90	115	205
Office appliance operators.....	1	11	12
Office clerks.....	575	214	789
Shipping clerks.....	320	18	338
Stenographers and typists.....	22	383	405
Total.....	1,051	745	1,796

65·48 per cent of those in clerical occupations are in Manitoba and Ontario. Manitoba leads in the number of accountants and auditors and Ontario in the number of bookkeepers, cashiers, office clerks, shipping clerks, stenographers and typists. Alberta leads in the number of office appliance operators.

*Labourers*

Since the term "labourer", so reported, gives no indication of the type of work performed, it cannot be classified under any of the occupation groups shown in the tables. Even a knowledge of the industry in which they are employed does not supply the necessary information on the type of work performed by a person reported as a labourer, for a labourer in a steel mill, for example, might as well be working in a construction, transport, etc. type of occupation as in an occupation directly concerned with the process of manufacture. There are 9,248 Ukrainians reported as labourers, of which 6,401 are in Manitoba and Ontario.

### Main Occupations

The occupations in which there are more than 1,000 gainfully occupied in a descending order of numerical strength are as follows:

Farmers and stockraisers (Agriculture).....	32,899
Farm Labourers (Agriculture).....	22,023
Labourers (not in agriculture, fishing, logging or mining).....	9,248
Domestic servants (not elsewhere stated under Personal Service).....	5,149
Sectionmen and trackmen (Transportation and Communication).....	3,902
Miners and millmen (Mining).....	2,381
Waiters and waitresses (Personal Service).....	2,031
Carpenters (Construction).....	2,014
Owners, managers—retail (Trade).....	1,982
Lumbermen (Logging).....	1,496
Employed in metal products (Manufacturing).....	1,452
Employed in clothing and textile products (Manufacturing).....	1,432
Salespersons in stores (Trade).....	1,404
Truck Drivers (Transportation and Communication).....	1,377
School Teachers (Professional Service).....	1,313
Mechanics and repairmen (not elsewhere specified under manufacturing).....	1,183
Housekeepers, stewards, matrons (Personal Service).....	1,101
Total.....	92,387

I should like to draw your attention to this paragraph.

The above includes 81·09 per cent of the gainfully occupied population. 89·48 per cent of the Ukrainians gainfully occupied are "producing the goods". 10·52 per cent are "handling the goods" or are in professional service.

I should like to stress the point that they are producers and not middle-men.

### Owners and Managers

Of the 113,921 reported as gainfully occupied of Ukrainian origin, 35,690 or 31·33 per cent are owners or managers, as follows:

Class of Occupation	Male	Female	Total
Agriculture.....	32,064	835	32,899
Logging.....	8		8
Mining and Quarrying.....	10		10
Manufacturing.....	121		121
Construction.....	45		45
Transportation and Communication.....	58	1	59
Trade.....	1,940	125	2,065
Finance.....	8		8
Recreational Service.....	142		142
Personal Service.....	276	57	333
Total.....	34,672	1,018	35,690

The distribution of owners and managers by provinces, divided between agriculture and other classes of occupations, is as follows:

	Agriculture	Other	Total
British Columbia.....	333	64	397
Alberta.....	10,309	619	10,928
Saskatchewan.....	11,672	582	12,254
Manitoba.....	9,364	819	10,183
Ontario.....	1,134	534	1,668
Quebec.....	75	163	238
Nova Scotia.....	12	10	22
Total.....	32,899	2,791	35,690

Saskatchewan leads in the total number of owners and managers and in the number of agriculture and recreational services. Manitoba leads in the



number in logging, manufacturing, construction, transportation, communication and trade. Ontario leads in the number in personal services. Quebec is the only province that has more owners and managers in other fields than in agriculture. In Quebec there are more in wholesale or retail trades alone than in agriculture.

### *Citizenship*

Of the foreign born Ukrainian population 78,061 were naturalized in the following periods:

—	Male	Female	Total
Before 1931.....	28,860	23,924	52,784
1931-1941.....	15,457	9,381	24,838
Not stated.....	222	217	439
Total.....	44,539	33,522	78,061

72.85 per cent of the Ukrainians that immigrated to Canada up to 1941 were naturalized.

Of the foreign born not naturalized Ukrainian population 28,069 give the following countries as their country of allegiance:

—	Male	Female	Total
United States.....	143	119	262
Austria.....	2,493	1,443	3,936
Czecho-Slovakia.....	238	230	468
Finland.....	5	9	14
Germany.....	22	23	45
Hungary.....	130	54	184
Italy.....	2	9	11
Poland.....	9,683	6,793	16,476
Russia.....	3,095	1,486	4,581
Scandinavian Countries.....	2	21	23
China.....	.....	7	7
Others and not stated.....	1,325	737	2,062
Total.....	17,138	10,931	28,069

27.15 per cent of the Ukrainians that immigrated up to 1941 remained unnaturalized, of which 75 per cent named Poland as their country of allegiance, 4,581 named Russia and 3,936 named Austria. Apparently most of these were of comparatively recent arrivals before the 1941 census taking.

The citizenship of the population of Ukrainian origin is as follows:

British subjects.....	277,832
Aliens.....	28,069
Not stated.....	28
Total.....	305,929

Of the Ukrainian total population 90.81 per cent are British subjects and 9.19 per cent are aliens or others who did not state their citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN: How long have those aliens been here?

Mr. ARSENYCH: There was a very small immigration group flowing in around 1931, and I would say that they were from within that period.

Mr. A. HLYNKA, M. P.: May I interrupt here? Those are 1941 statistics. Since the change in the Citizenship Act, persons who, for instance, had been farming and did not have sufficient knowledge of either the English or French

language and who were barred from receiving naturalization certificates, can now receive certificates even though they may not have sufficient knowledge of the language, just so long as they have resided in Canada for twenty years or more and have proven to be good citizens.

Mr. ARSENYCH:

*Official Language and Mother Tongue*

Official languages are not to be confused with mother tongues. By mother tongue is meant the first language learned in childhood if still understood by the person. Mother tongue, being used in the home, is natural to a person even if he is unable to speak it on account of youth, infirmity or for some other reason, where as the official language or languages are those recognized by statute for general use. Thus the immigrants to a new country bring with them their mother tongues and continue to use them in their homes, but these have no relation to the official languages in the country of their adoption.

The population of Ukrainian origin speaking one, both, or neither of the official languages of Canada, is as follows:

Language spoken	Male	Female	Total
English only.....	152,418	127,792	280,210
French only.....	95	94	189
English and French.....	2,432	1,725	4,157
Neither English nor French.....	7,655	13,718	21,373
Total.....	162,600	142,329	305,929

Of the total Ukrainian population 91.27 per cent use English as their official language. 6.98 per cent could not speak English or French in 1941 as compared to 20.02 per cent in 1931.

*Age*

The population of Ukrainian origin divided into five-year age groups, is as follows:

—	Male	Female	Total
0-4.....	14,366	14,082	28,448
5-9.....	15,750	15,659	31,409
10-14.....	16,964	16,648	33,612
15-19.....	17,396	17,835	35,231
20-24.....	15,672	16,327	31,999
25-29.....	14,396	13,986	28,382
30-34.....	10,876	10,712	21,588
35-39.....	12,123	10,045	22,168
40-44.....	9,989	6,764	16,753
45-49.....	10,364	6,428	16,792
50-54.....	8,476	4,922	13,398
55-59.....	6,459	3,387	9,846
60-64.....	4,038	2,264	6,302
65-69.....	2,782	1,907	4,689
70-74.....	1,478	1,194	2,672
75-79.....	863	685	1,548
80-84.....	409	327	736
85-89.....	152	127	279
90-94.....	32	26	58
95 and up.....	15	4	19
Total.....	162,600	143,329	305,929

30.55 per cent of the Ukrainians are 14 years of age or less, 12.93 per cent are 50 years of age or more, and 56.52 per cent are between the ages of 15 and 49. The 15-19 age group is the largest including 11.51 per cent of the

population. There are more males than females in all age groups except between the ages of 15 and 24. Saskatchewan has more children up to 14 years of age than any other province. Manitoba has more of all the other age groups than any other province. 42·12 per cent of those that are 80 years old or more are in Manitoba.

### Education

The number of children under 15 years of age divided into five-year age groups, is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
0-4.....	14,366	14,082	28,448
5-9.....	15,750	15,659	31,409
10-14.....	16,964	16,648	33,612
Total.....	47,080	46,389	93,469

The population, divided between those at school and those not at school, is as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
At School.....	33,150	32,407	65,557
Not at School.....	129,450	110,922	240,372
Total.....	162,600	143,329	305,929

Most children reporting school attendance are between 5 and 14 years of age. There are 65,021 children in this age group as compared with 65,557 of the population reported at school.

The population classified according to the number of years of schooling is as follows:

Years of Schooling	Male	Female	Total
0-4.....	74,771	70,949	145,720
5-8.....	66,644	54,200	120,844
9-12.....	18,229	16,667	34,896
13 or more.....	2,543	1,268	3,811
Not stated.....	413	245	658
Total.....	162,600	143,329	305,929

41·06 per cent of those that have less than 5 years of schooling are children under 10 years of age. 39·5 per cent of the population has 5-8 years of schooling and 12·65 per cent have a high school education or better.

### Rural Urban Population:

The distribution of Ukrainian rural and urban population as compared with the total population is as follows:

#### British Columbia:

	Ukrainian		British Columbia	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	3,177	42·01	443,394	54·21
Rural.....	4,386	57·99	374,467	45·79
Total.....	7,563	100·00	817,861	100·00

*Alberta:*

	Ukrainian		Alberta	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	13,398	18·64	306,586	38·51
Rural.....	53,470	81·36	459,583	61·49
Total.....	71,868	100·00	796,169	100·00

*Saskatchewan:*

	Ukrainian		Saskatchewan	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	14,751	18·49	295,146	32·94
Rural.....	65,026	81·51	600,846	67·06
Total.....	79,777	100·00	895,992	100·00

*Manitoba:*

	Ukrainian		Manitoba	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	30,925	34·45	321,873	44·11
Rural.....	53,837	65·55	407,871	55·89
Total.....	89,762	100·00	729,744	100·00

*Ontario:*

	Ukrainian		Ontario	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	33,635	69·84	2,338,633	61·74
Rural.....	14,523	30·16	1,449,022	38·26
Total.....	48,158	100·00	3,787,655	100·00

*Quebec:*

	Ukrainian		Quebec	
	Population	Percentage	Population	Percentage
Urban.....	7,481	93·44	2,109,684	63·32
Rural.....	525	6·56	1,222,198	36·68
Total.....	8,006	100·00	3,331,882	100·00

*Maritime Provinces:*

There are 735 Ukrainians in the Maritime Provinces—2 in Prince Edward Island, 711 in Nova Scotia, and 22 in New Brunswick; distributed numerically about equally in the following occupations:

Agriculture  
Mining  
Fishing  
Logging  
Manufacturing

Chemical Products  
Construction  
Transportation  
Trade.



In Canada there is that saving quality of family life, good neighbourly responsibility and the value of human life that does not exist in any totalitarian state.

It is because of these conditions and the inherent qualities of our race that the Canadians of Ukrainian descent have found it possible within the last fifty years to become part and parcel of Canada.

Though they form only 2.66 per cent of the total Canadian population, their participation in the industrial life of Canada, especially in basic industries and in the war effort is much higher than their numerical proportion to other races.

In the Hong Kong expedition, Canadians of Ukrainian descent contributed over ten per cent, and in the Dieppe and Normandy invasions their percentage was higher than their proportion to the population of Canada. This also applies to our general participation in the Canadian armed forces.

It was during the short period of Canada's war effort that Canadians of all racial groups and origins were suddenly elevated in their conception of citizenship, were raised above the petty circle of personal and even family interests to the true width and splendour of national life.

Hon. Mr. EULER: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? I do not wish to interrupt the witness, but in speaking of these Ukrainians in Canada, is there among them any organization or organizations of a communistic nature?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Yes, unfortunately there is. However, that organization is composed of different nationalities or different racial origins.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Is it true that the majority of the people are communists?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would not deny that.

Hon. Mr. EULER: The majority?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Yes, but they were led into these organizations by different means.

The CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute, you do not suggest that the majority of Ukrainians are communistically inclined?

Hon. Mr. EULER: That is what you said a moment ago.

Mr. ARSENYCH: I understood the question was that the majority of communistic organizations have a predominance of Ukrainians.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Would you make an estimate of what the percentage would be?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would say that the number of Canadians of Ukrainian origin opposed to communism would be about 90 per cent of the whole 305,000.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What percentage?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Ninety per cent.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Opposed to communism?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Yes, opposed to communism. They are definitely opposed to communism and they have been waging and combating the influences of communism for years before other racial groups realized the danger.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Have they any organizations to support communism?

Mr. ARSENYCH: They have Tim Buck as a leader, and they have other leaders.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Have they native leaders? Have they leaders of the Ukrainian race?

Mr. ARSENYCH: They have a member in the legislature in Manitoba, but out of the seven members of Ukrainian origin he is the only one there. That shows the proportion more or less, and mind you, he was not elected by Ukrainian vote only. He was elected by a combination of all racial groups.

The CHAIRMAN: A rural or city man?

Mr. ARSENYCH: A city man, from the city of Winnipeg.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: He was elected under the proportional system?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I may be anticipating what you are going to say later, but it comes in quite properly at this point. You are now really pleading on behalf of the quarter of a million displaced persons in Europe.

Mr. ARSENYCH: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are they all displaced because they are non-communistic?

Mr. ARSENYCH: That is why they are outside of Ukrainian territories.

Hon. Mr. EULER: So that their immigration into Canada would not increase the sentiment here for communism.

Mr. ARSENYCH: On the contrary, it would help to cure those who are infected by that creed, because they would speak of their own experiences.

The point we wish to make in our submission is that the Canadians of Ukrainian origin are not of an unknown quality and while in the early stage of our immigration there was room for fear and apprehension because of the lack of information on the part of those who dared the venture of drawing upon the source of immigration from the Ukrainian lands, in view of their accomplishments and record, as we have them, there is no more need for such apprehension at present.

Farming, mining, lumbering, pulp and manufacturing industries and transportation are basic in Canada, and must be maintained, and can only be maintained by those who have the stamina to produce and to create. Production in any industry and in any country will stand only a limited number of middle class or middlemen. Canada can stand a very large number of immigrants that are by their inherent qualities inclined to produce. Middlemen will grow out of the producing class by the natural process. The figures we have submitted show that the Canadians of Ukrainian descent contribute the largest per cent of producers employed in basic industries in comparison with all other racial groups forming the population of Canada. I make that statement advisedly basing it on figures that can be scrutinized.

It is in the interest of Canada to maintain a proper balance between rural and urban population and this particular point in selecting new immigrants must be of paramount consideration. Here again we submit that statistics show that the Canadians of Ukrainian descent by their inherent love of land help to maintain that balance. We often see comments in the press that there is a tendency amongst the farming population of Canada to flock into the cities. This problem does not exist insofar as the farming community in Ukrainian settlements is concerned.

Our previous brief fully deals with the achievement of Ukrainians in Canada in the field of agriculture. It is a fact of general recognition that in grain production, stock and poultry raising and generally in intensive and mixed farming they are easily amongst the first.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I do not wish to interrupt the speaker, but may I ask a question? It is true that these people should go on the farms and should be properly equipped, but if displaced persons come to Canada would they have any means by which they could operate farms?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I am going to deal with that point later. I submit that everyone of them is prepared to take employment where he can produce.

Hon. Mr. EULER: As hired men?

Mr. ARSENYCH: As hired men or settling on a piece of land with the assistance of those already here; and in that regard I submit that it is easier now to settle a few thousand Ukrainians from Europe than it was in the years gone by. We have already 300,000 well established people of that race here, who have sympathy for those with no homes to go to.

Hon. Mr. EULER: My only point is that they are not supplied with capital.

Mr. ARSENYCH: They are not. They may have a certain amount of capital, but it would be in German marks. If there was any way of converting that capital into sound dollars they would have some ready cash.

Hon. Mr. EULER: There is not much chance of that, is there?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I do not know.

They all perform a very useful function in the industry of truck-gardening and supplying material for canning and sugarbeet factories. In transportation and maintenance they are amongst the best. I submit that the railway companies may rely on a large number of Canadians of Ukrainian descent maintaining the right of way.

They are not spectacular but predictable and dependable. They are not wealthy but enjoy a safe measure of economic independence. They live within their means and put their heart into anything they do. They meet their financial obligations. They are self-reliant and thrifty and at the same time generous and hospitable. They are aware of the fact that their fellow-citizens of various racial origins have many good habits, ways of life and characteristics worthy of admiration and assimilation. But they are also cognizant of the fact that some habits and customs should be definitely avoided. They learn new ways but do not accept them indiscriminately.

We also wish to make a point that Canada definitely needs for her own good, safety and prosperity a much larger population than we now have.

Canada was fortunate enough (under the strong wing of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the strong and good neighbour to the South) to attain her maturity and a measure of strength and prosperity, but we can little afford during these difficult times to become self-satisfied and miss the opportunity of filling our vast spaces with an additional flow of immigration that will add to our strength and vitality.

In connection with the Tables of Statistics compiled from the 1941 census we wish to underline the following salient points:

1. That the male population of Ukrainian origin exceeds the female population. This characteristic is not exceptional to Canadian citizens of Ukrainian descent. It applies equally to the Ukrainian population in their native land, hence Ukrainians as a race have always had a surplus of manpower. We never had a problem of old maids.

The CHAIRMAN: How do you account for that?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN: There are more boy babies born than girl babies?

Hon. Mr. EULER: That is the condition in spite of the havocs of war?

Mr. ARSENYCH: In spite of the havocs of war. The same figures in respect to male and female proportions prevail as to the displaced persons—there is a predominant number of males.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: You work your women too hard.

Mr. ARSENYCH: 2. That Canadians of Ukrainian descent are definitely and chiefly a class of producers, and not middlemen by their nature.

3. That their largest number is in the farming industry and is bearing proportionately the highest percentage of farming population in Canada compared with other groups combined.



4. That they contribute the largest percentage of rural, in contrast to urban population, in comparison with all other groups in Canada.

5. That they never sought any special privileges nor immunities on the ground of creed or nationality in Canada.

6. That their religion, customs, habits and racial characteristics do not constitute any impediment to a complete fusion of the national life of Canada, and there is no sign that they may as a racial group remain in isolation in the Canadian national structure.

7. That there is no incident during their fifty years' residence in Canada of any social or political problem by reason of their origin.

8. That they are a factor in stabilizing Canadian industries and national economy.

Ukrainian immigration to Canada was for the first time tried as an experiment approximately fifty years ago, and its flow to Canada during that period stood more or less as follows:

	Male	Female	Total
Before 1921.....	36,915	24,983	61,898
1921 to 1930.....	22,191	14,893	37,084
1931 to 1935.....	1,688	1,905	3,593
1936 to 1939.....	1,932	2,377	4,309
1940 to 1941.....	62	53	115
Not stated.....	102	58	160
Total.....	62,890	44,269	107,159

During the last fifty years, the Ukrainian territory in Europe whence this immigration came from, was partly under Russia, partly under Austria, partly under Poland, partly under Roumania, partly under Czechoslovakia; but since the last war all the Ukrainian territory is within the Soviet Russia.

We may safely say that from now on as long as Soviet Russia is in control of the Ukrainian territory, there will be no immigration from that source. Even the brides of English soldiers are not allowed to get out of that country.

At the present time there is, however, an unusual and highly abnormal situation existing in Europe as a result of the recent war, which has no parallel in the recorded history of mankind.

A mass of mankind composed of men, women and children running into almost a million, composed of all racial groups, 250,000 amongst them of Ukrainian origin, finds a temporary refuge in the American and British zones of occupation, suffering want and extreme hardships, but most of all—uncertainty as to their future. They refuse to return to their native lands. Strange as it is, it is hardly necessary to search for a reason for such a state of affairs.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is the United States admitting any of these people over and above their quota?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I could not say whether they are or not. I am not familiar with American immigration laws, but I understand that there is some effort to allow a large proportion of these people to come in, perhaps more than before the war.

The CHAIRMAN: My understanding is that there are considerable numbers of these people coming into the United States, over and above the quota set up.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I do not think so.

Mr. HLYNKA: Not of Ukrainian origin.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: A measure has been introduced only recently in Congress because the quota applies only on a month by month basis, and they are not



allowed to capitalize on that. As far as I know the figures are even below the quota, and of course in some races, such as the Baltics, the quota is hopelessly small. But there has been a recent measure introduced in Congress, and despite the Truman directive of a year ago which would allow a quota of 9,000, I think something under 4,000 came in.

Mr. HLYNKA: At this point may I say that the Ukrainians are not classed as a separate nationality at the present time, and as far as the United States is concerned Ukrainians have no quota. They do come under the Polish quota, the Russian quota, the Roumanian quota and the Czechoslovakian quota, and it is always the case that it is the Pole, the Russian, or the Czechoslovak who gets in—that is, of those who are out—and the Ukrainians stand a very small chance of coming in.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): But under that arrangement really are more Ukrainians coming in than there would be if they were classified as a separate race?

Mr. HLYNKA: No, it is the other way. The others are let in under their own distinct racial groups, and the Ukrainians are left usually at the tail-end of the line. That is what has happened.

Mr. ARSENYCH: The United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations, including Canada, did not find any of her sons and daughters dilatory and reluctant to return to their homes as soon as the opportunity for their return was open to them.

Drawing on the pool of refugees as a Canadian source of immigration, would solve the crying problem of displaced persons in Central Europe and would also partly solve the question of immigration for Canada, adding new strength and vitality to Canadian industries and manpower.

Dealing further with the question of the possibility of Ukrainian refugees being a source of immigration, we wish to deal with figures and statistics.

The Ukrainian Canadian Committee was fortunate enough to have our President, Rev. Dr. W. Kushnir, and our Vice-President, Very Rev. S. W. Sawchuk, make a special trip to the British and American zones of occupation in Germany to get a first-hand information in so far as refugees are concerned. Our friend Mr. Hlynka also made a trip overseas in his official capacity and also as personally interested in this question, and made a survey of the situation.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Who are the nationals whom you said were in these zones? The Poles and Russians and who else?

Mr. ARSENYCH: The countries are Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Poland.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: They now control what you call Ukraine?

Mr. ARSENYCH: No; Ukraine is now entirely under the control of Soviet Russia.

Hon. Mr. EULER: They will not let them out?

Mr. ARSENYCH: They will not let them out, and they would like to force all others to return.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): That is what I would like to get in my head. I did not get it clearly.

Mr. ARSENYCH: The Ukrainian territory before the recent war was divided among different states. Now it is entirely within Soviet Union.

Hon. Mr. EULER: It is only displaced persons you are referring to?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Exactly. And there is no other available source any more.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: We had a representation made to us last week and I have been wondering ever since what Ukrainians they expected to bring to Canada, because they object to displaced persons.

Mr. ARSENYCH: Our Committee is also maintaining at the present time four representatives, two men and two women, natural born Canadians of Ukrainian origin, who have a long record of creditable service in Canadian armed forces overseas, and who have been for the last four months working and co-operating with the Occupational Forces in Europe, and from them we have a complete survey and statistical data concerning Ukrainian refugees, which is as follows:—

The number of Ukrainian refugees in Germany and Austria is about 250,000, made up of:

Male.....	147,000 or 59%
Female.....	103,000 or 41%
<i>Their ages—</i>	
Children up to 15 years.....	41,000 or 16.5%
Between 16 to 60 years.....	203,000 or 81%
Above 60 years.....	6,000 or 2.5%
<i>Employable—</i>	
Male over 15 years.....	124,000
Female over 15 years.....	79,000
Total.....	203,000 or 81%
<i>Unemployable—</i>	
Over 15 years of age.....	6,000 or 2.5%
Children up to 15 years.....	41,000 or 16.5%
<i>Occupations of employables—</i>	
Farmers.....	45%
Labourers.....	18%
Tradesmen.....	16%
Intellectuals, scientists and technicians.....	17%
Others.....	4%

Suitable for agriculture irrespective of occupations, 80 per cent.

Unsuitable for agriculture industry including tradesmen, 20 per cent.

Intellectuals not suitable for farming industry, 5 per cent.

Hon. Mr. EULER: That makes 105 per cent.

Mr. ARSENYCH: There must be a clerical mistake. But the general survey is there.

The total number is based on approximately 100,000 families.

50,000 families or 50 per cent are fit to be engaged in farming industry on their own;

50,000 or 50 per cent suitable as farm labourers;

20,000 of individuals more or less, composed of craftsmen and tradesmen and intellectuals;

suitable to render personal services in connection with farming industry, about 20,000 or 20 per cent.

It is fortunate for us all that there still is a British and an American zone of safety.

Canada with her empty spaces and vast natural resources is looking for a new source of immigration. Our submission is that there is and perhaps never will be a better source from which to draw our immigration than from this pool of refugees who are anxious to find a sanctuary and willing to start life anew in a new land and in a new environment.

May we quote from an opinion recently published in *Social Research* applying to the refugees in general to the following effect:—

Of all classes of potential immigrants they can most confidently be expected to contribute to the economics of their new homelands and to the stable elements in the society as farmers, factory-workers, industrialists, scientists, technicians and artisans. They represent a good cross-

section of the best that the old world offers in the way of human material. From the humanitarian point of view there is certainly no group of human beings living today who more desperately need the chance of resettlement than these displaced persons in Germany and Austria.

Speaking of the Ukrainian group of refugees, our submission is that they are a better counterpart of their kinsmen who today enjoy the privileges and perform their duties as citizens of Canada.

The above figures give a very general survey of the Ukrainian Displaced Persons in the British and American zones of occupation. There are to be found several thousands of Ukrainian refugees in the French zones of occupation as well and their composition is very analogous to the group already dealt with.

All Ukrainian refugees form a cross-section of the most enterprising, most determined and the most dependable class of the Ukrainian people. They represent all levels of trades, occupations and professions of the nation in a well balanced proportion. All of them have a definite background as producers and not as middlemen. All of them are sons of the soil.

Though their position as refugees is of a temporary nature and uncertain future, their camps constitute well organized miniature communities, functioning in an orderly fashion on a co-operative basis, and maintaining a skeleton of all essential institutions of a civilized community.

We find that their orphans are taken care of. Kindergartens, boy scouts and girl guides organizations are functioning amongst them.

Churches are built, served and maintained under the supervision of their own church dignitaries from the Bishops down to clergymen of all ranks.

Hon. Mr. EULER: It is not perhaps important, but I suppose these people are largely adherents or members of the Greek Catholic Church, are they?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I think that the predominant number are Greek Catholics, for this reason, that from Russia, or that part of Ukrainian territory which was under the control of Russia prior to this war there are very few refugees; that part which was under Polish occupation, there were mostly Greek Catholics and they form the larger percentage of the displaced persons.

They maintain public schools, high schools and universities, manned by qualified staffs from amongst the refugees.

Their hospitals are manned by competent doctors, nurses and orderlies.

They have skeletons of factories, re-making, mending and supplying clothing, household furniture for the Camps, leather goods and shoe factories.

They augment their rations by cultivating every available patch of land around the Camp.

They have their own police and Courts of Justice manned by qualified judiciaries of their own.

Amongst the intellectuals, though small in number, we find medical doctors, surgeons, scientists, economists, experts in the field of manufacture, dairying, forestry, veterinary science, social workers and above all, farmers and tradesmen.

We know of a group of six hundred forestry experts, well qualified in theory and practice, who would be anxious to render their services to any country that would be willing to accept them.

There is a group of manufacturers with a nucleus factory of strings for musical instruments. There is a nucleus of manufacturers and experts in plastic industry.

There is a unit, and working as a unit for the American Army of Occupation, of manufacturers of leather goods for the army.

Here is the material to choose from. Any and all of them feel fortunate if the Canadian choice should fall upon them.



In Canada, with their background as producers, they would be prepared to do any useful work of a creative nature. They would find a willing co-operation and assistance from their kinsmen here. They would help to strengthen the stability of our national and economic structure along the lines established by their kinsmen during the last fifty years. *And they may well be a factor in the preservation of our democracy, as we understand it, and the Canadian way of life. I thank you.*

The Ukrainian Canadian Committee,  
Rev. Dr. B. Kushnir, President,  
J. D. Arsenych, Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN: We thank you very much. That has been a very fine presentation, and it will be printed in the record.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: May we ask questions of the witness? You admit that 10 per cent of the Ukrainians belong to the communist party. How can you explain the fact that from people who have lived under the conditions that they have lived under for so long and have been allowed to come to perhaps the freest country on the face of the earth where they have all done well and have the same right as Canadian born citizens, even one Ukrainian has become a communist?

Mr. ARSENYCH: There is no justification, but there is an explanation.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: I should like to hear it.

Mr. ARSENYCH: We are dealing with a force that is not situated in Canada. The influences are from abroad and there are various ways used to lure the people, gullible people, into innocent formations to begin with, and that has been going on systematically with assistance from abroad. It is not hard to find traces of that assistance. An organization is functioning in this regard and naturally the immigrants or newcomers, not accustomed to the ways of life here and not knowing the language as yet, have easily fallen into innocent associations.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Would you think that the percentage of communists among the Ukrainians is any greater than among other races?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would not say that.

The CHAIRMAN: Can it not be summed up in the few words: The perversities of human nature?

Mr. ARSENYCH: Exactly so, yes sir.

The CHAIRMAN: We have got the same thing in all other classes of our citizenship.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Some of these people are in the unfortunate position where their families are still under control. Many of these people came out to Canada and have not been able to bring their wives and immediate families with them.

Mr. ARSENYCH: My submission is that if the members of those families were able to come to Canada they would help to correct the situation.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What percentage did you say of the Canadians of Ukrainian descent are communistic?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would say 10 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN: Ten per cent of 305,000.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): That is good enough.

The CHAIRMAN: Even the Scotch have got that much of a percentage.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Have these people become communists since they came to Canada or were they communists before they came here?

Mr. ARSENYCH: No, I think they were not communists before they came here.



Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Well, why do they not get out of Canada?

Mr. ARSENYCH: I would like to see them get out.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Why do they not?

Hon. Mr. EULER: Where could they go, Russia?

Mr. ARSENYCH: They ought to go to a communistic paradise and try their experiments in their own hides.

Mr. EUSTACE WASYLYSHEN, member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee: Mr. Chairman, and honourable members of the committee, I should like to add only a few words to what has already been said about the immigration and labour committee. I know of no other body in Canada which has contributed as much as your committee to the enlightenment of public opinion on the question of immigration. I am also certain that your committee deserves a large share of credit for the steps which the Canadian government has already taken in making provisions for the admission to Canada of at least closest relatives of Canadians. May I therefore, on behalf of many families of Ukrainian origin, express deep appreciation for what you have already done and for what you are doing.

I might say a further word about one group of displaced persons who have been overlooked thus so far. I refer to Ukrainians from the province of Bukowina, which was under Roumania prior to World War II. These Ukrainians are to-day barred from entry into Canada as they are classified as enemy nationals. We might point out that Ukrainians from the province of Bukowina did not bear arms against the allies, though Roumanians did. Ukrainians from this area were shipped to Germany as slave labour, and they have remained there ever since. The territory from which they came was annexed by the Soviet Union during the war and Ukrainians have no country to go to. I should like to emphasize again that the Ukrainians from the province of Bukowina have never been our enemies and should therefore be eligible for emmigration to Canada. We only trust and hope that the Canadian government will correct this injustice.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are they displaced persons because they were exiled?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: They were forcibly taken by the Germans as slave labourers.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And are they among those the Russians would like to rehabilitate and take back?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: They certainly are, and the Russians are trying to get back every person in these displaced persons camps of Ukrainian origin.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Are they in a group together?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: No, they are mixed and concentrated among other displaced persons.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: How large is the province of Bukowina?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: It is a very small part of the Ukraine proper, and the population before the war was three-quarters of a million.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: And were all those people shipped out?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: No.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: How many?

Mr. WASYLYSHEN: Only a small percentage; I would say about ten per cent of the total population of displaced persons are from Bukowina. It is not a very large percentage, but there were cases here in Canada where men applied for their sisters or brothers who are at the present time among the displaced persons, and the department of immigration refused to issue a permit of entry on account of the fact that they are classified as enemy aliens.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that within the near future there will be a measure put through by this government, as there is now being placed before the United States Congress and Senate, to sign a peace treaty with four or five of those former enemy countries. When that has been done these people will no longer be regarded as enemy aliens. I hope, and in fact believe, that that is being contemplated and will be put through before very long.

Hon. Mr. McGUIRE: It is very long in coming. One country has gone behind the iron curtain in the last few days. A lot of Hungarian people who had become Canadian citizens wanted their mothers, brothers, and sisters brought here. Applications were granted by the Department and now they may as well be thrown away as there is no doubt that these people will not come out of Hungary and more. It will not be long before they are all liquidated.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Might I ask you a question, Mr. Chairman? I have a fairly distinct recollection that last year this committee heard a deputation or some member of the Ukrainian group—perhaps I am wrong—and we questioned him rather closely with regard to the communistic affiliation of those people.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is so.

Hon. Mr. EULER: He himself admitted that he was a communist. I do not question the statements made by Mr. Arsenych, who made such an excellent presentation, but I am wondering whether they gibe with the statements made by the gentleman who appeared before us last year?

The CHAIRMAN: I think our friend Mr. Hlynka can make us clear on that.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I believe the man who appeared before us last year was Finnish.

Mr. HLYNKA: Last year the arrangements were such that the two groups were called on the same day. There was the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, which is making the presentation to-day, and after this delegation made its presentation, the communist group was called. They had been invited to appear also, and, of course, they were arguing against Ukrainian immigration into Canada because they wanted all the Ukrainians to go back to the Soviet Union. I remember that honourable senators questioned this gentleman very closely. Although people such as this gentleman do not openly admit that they are communists, everyone knows they are.

Hon. Mr. EULER: The speaker who was here admitted it.

Mr. HLYNKA: On June 5th of this year you had a presentation from the same group. I have not received a printed copy of their presentation as it has not yet been printed, but they again tried very cleverly to put over the idea that some Ukrainians over there are collaborationists. They do this with the intention of discrediting them in the eyes of the Canadian public, and with the ultimate result, in aim, that the Soviet Union could get their hands on them. The delegation appearing here to-day is opposed to communism just as are the majority of Ukrainians opposed to it. I am glad the question was asked because it gave me an opportunity to clarify the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: If you read the record of the 5th of June I think you will find out what they said. We did not understand that they represented a pronounced number of people.

The Very Reverend Dr. BASIL KUSHNIR: Mr. Chairman, and Honourable Members of the Senate Committee:

First of all I wish to express the gratitude of our Ukrainian Canadian Committee to the Canadian Government for everything that has been done in respect to facilitating immigration to Canada.

Naturally, we do need immigration. We need it for various reasons: (1) To increase our population. (2) To get more labour in our industries and on our farms. (3) To get good and loyal citizens.

To achieve this we have to consider two extremely important factors: the foundation upon which Canada has been built until the present day, and upon which Canada should prosper in the future. The factors are: (1) Christian idealism, and (2) The missionary vision of life. These factors are the real foundation of Canada.

Having this in view, we should determine our immigration policy. We have to get the type of immigration that would agree with the basic social structure of Canada. The Displaced Persons in general, and the Displaced Persons of Ukrainian origin in particular, are the prospective immigrants that might very well fit into our Canadian life. They are Christian idealists, thrifty people with a missionary vision.

Admission to Canada of families of people already admissible under previous regulations, is a step of such elementary justice that one can wonder why it had not been taken in the first place. Admission of Britons and Americans on a virtually unlimited scale, subject only to reasonable standard of health, character and employability, needs no great defence either. These are potential Canadians in a special sense—they usually become Canadians almost immediately after they come to Canada. They are familiar with our mode of government, our habits of thought and action and are able to easily and quickly fit into the Canadian pattern.

The third category now admissible for the first time, are refugees in the Displaced Persons Camps in Europe. These are the homeless, the kinless, the men and women now without a future. Of all those who seek entry to Canada, these surely are the ones for whom mercy and humaneness should speak most strongly. We speak on their behalf to-day. We are sure that when they are admitted to Canada, they will become good workers and loyal citizens. We are sure that a favourable decision of our Government to open the doors for those people will be recognized as a generous opportunity for sharing Canada's heritage to the mutual benefit of all.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. HLYNKA: Mr. Chairman, to conclude the presentation may I say a few words?? As some may know, I made a three-month tour of Europe last fall and the first part of this year. I visited many displaced persons camps in the British and American zones of Germany; I also visited Italy, France and of course the United Kingdom. Since my return to Canada I have been lecturing at various points from Edmonton right across this country, and I have already addressed about twenty meetings.

Knowing how strongly the communists felt about their ideology it was surprising to me that at my meetings some communist followers came forward and donated money to help displaced persons. The tide is turning. All that is required is an explanation of what is going on and a little more work. Of course, I try to do my little share in that regard. I know that if the Canadian public was wide awake to this problem and understood it properly and if public opinion was properly informed we would stamp out a lot of communism here.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Did you hear some argument at your meetings that these people should be forced to go back to Europe?

Mr. HLYNKA: Yes, that is their chief argument.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: That is the communists' argument?

Mr. HLYNKA: That is the argument of the leaders. May I say that I never attack what I call "the stomach communists." They are the people who became communists because of economic conditions in the 30's or something of that sort. But I do attack the leaders. I think this practice is fair, because if



the ordinary worker, the ordinary farmer, is given facts it naturally has its effect; and I feel that it is a mistake to attack the ordinary type of man who, for economic reasons or otherwise—perhaps through lack of knowledge of conditions and so on—becomes a supporter of communism. I think that the attack should be directed upon those who are definitely agents of a foreign power in Canada. That is the whole problem.

May I add one further thought? So far as I know at the present time we admit only farmers and those who have close relatives here. But I believe that if Canada admitted at least a handful of intellectuals, capable of telling the people about conditions over there and the experiences they have had during this war and prior to it, it would help so much to clear up the situation. At the present time the intellectuals are barred under our regulations. My suggestion is that we should bring in at least a handful of these people so that they may inform us and everyone else in Canada concerning this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Hlynka, and your associates for the splendid representation made to us this morning, and I am quite sure that the committee will do what it can to advance the proper application of the things so many of us desire.

We have with us Mr. Alex Skelton, Director General of Economic Research, whom we will all be glad to hear.

Mr. ALEX SKELTON: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen:

This submission is basically a sequel to that given last year by Mr. Stewart Bates, then Director General of the Economic Research Branch. Some changes and evolution have taken place in Canadian industry since then, and some of the needs and problems in relation to immigration are a little clearer and more developed. Material on this has been compiled by the Economic Research Branch, and by Miss Addison of that Branch in particular, and I should like, with your permission, to read a statement based on it. As to the statement itself, I must take responsibility for it. Copies are available.

This statement, like the previous brief, deals primarily with the economic aspect of immigration rather than the political, social or cultural sides of the question. This does not mean that the importance of these phases, particularly the humanitarian, is not recognized, but rather that they fall outside the scope of this brief. Stress has also been laid primarily on the needs of industry rather than those of agriculture. At present there is a current shortage of agricultural labour that will have to be met, but it was not felt necessary to deal with the relationship of agriculture and immigration for the following reasons. (1) A good deal of data has already been presented to the Senate Committee on the subject of agricultural immigration. (2) The immigration regulations permit the entry of agriculturalists. (3) A revolution has been taking place in agriculture through greater mechanization. Improvements in farm technology made it possible during the war for output to be maintained and even increased, although farm labour was greatly reduced. This, coupled with recent estimates of potential farm lands available for settlement, would suggest that large numbers of additional farmers may not be required to ensure agricultural production sufficient for future needs. (4) There has been a changeover in Canada from an economy based primarily on agriculture to one of greater industrialization (largely in manufacturing). This shift, which has been hastened by the war, makes the industrial approach to the immigration problem an extremely pertinent one at the present time. Before considering immigration in relation to this changing economic pattern, it might be well to sketch in the background with reference to the industrial structure as it appears to-day and the outlook the immediate future.



### *The Industrial Structure*

The rapid development of Canadian industry during the war years was based largely on the increased diversification that had been taking place in our industrial structure prior to 1939. During the period between the two wars agriculture was being gradually replaced by manufacturing as the chief contributor to the total output of the country and this process was accelerated during the war. In terms of value agriculture in 1919 contributed 44 per cent of the total production in both primary and secondary industries while manufacturing amounted to only one-third. By 1943, this position was reversed as manufacturing accounted for as much as 54 per cent of wartime production and agriculture made up only 20 per cent. Estimates for 1946 indicate that agriculture has risen to about one-quarter, but manufacturing still provides the larger share contributing over 46 per cent of total output. New high levels of employment and income have resulted from this increased industrial activity—from the expansion of manufacturing relative to other industries, from the diversifications within manufacturing itself and the shift in emphasis away from the primary to the intermediate and final stages of manufacture. But the sudden expansion and diversification of industry revealed manpower shortages and gaps appeared among the managerial and professional classes, in the technical and scientific groups, and among certain skilled craftsmen, particularly in the occupations hit by the depression.

It is upon the skill and enterprise of these groups within the labour force that the continued diversification and increased efficiency of industry will depend. If the high levels of income and employment achieved during the war and the reconversion period are to be maintained, there will have to be continued expansion, not so much in the primary industries that will remain basic, providing essential foods and raw materials, but rather in the secondary industries, in the service trades, in the improved distribution of our goods both at home and abroad. In order to introduce the industrial innovations and adaptations necessary for this economic progress to take place, initiative and resourcefulness on the part of both management and labour will be needed.

Entrepreneurs will have to find new or more effective uses for our resources and skill, whether in the production of new products, in the creation of new services, in the more efficient use of labour, or in more effective distribution methods. Scientists will have to discover new products and develop new processes in order to keep up with changing demand in the domestic and world market. Skilled workmen will be needed to carry through new developments in the most efficient way. Industry that cannot compete in the home or foreign market will need to be replaced by other industrial developments that will satisfy economic wants. If the present industrial structure is to be retained and expanded, foresight, intelligence and energy will be needed to increase facilities for production, to establish and maintain markets, to strengthen Canada's competitive position through adjustment to the changing pattern of demand.

The growing industrialization of the Canadian economy has been accompanied during recent years by high levels of income and employment. During the later war years, the gross national product was more than double the 1938 figure and almost a million more people were employed. Present conditions indicate that this high level is being maintained. Provided crop conditions remain average, it is expected that the gross national product for 1947 will reach about \$12 billion as compared with \$11.1 billion in 1946. While most of this increase will result from price rise, there will probably be some increase in aggregate physical production. It is expected that this will be attended by a greater volume of employment, as well as some improvement in non-agricultural productivity. The factors that are sustaining this output are much the same as those operating in 1946, although there has been some shift in emphasis. Government expenditures are continuing to decrease with the winding-

up of wartime commitments, but private investment is expected to be even greater in 1947, with more outlay on new plant and equipment than in 1946. There is still a good deal of pent-up consumer demand to be satisfied in many fields both in consumers' durables, (e.g. automobiles, refrigerators, etc.,) and in some non-durables, such as clothing. The aggregate volume of personal savings, although increasing at a reduced rate, is higher than ever. Wages and salaries are in excess of the wartime peak and total disposable income in the hands of individuals will probably be higher than in any other year. The export market continues to be buoyant and judging by returns for the first quarter of this year, export sales in dollar terms should exceed 1946 by a considerable margin. It should be borne in mind, however, that the large volume of exports to the United Kingdom and other European countries is continuing to be sustained by Canadian loans and export credits and that these are essentially transitional measures. In summary, it appears that a sustained level of activity and improved production are to be expected in the industrial sector of the economy during 1947, but there will be shortages of labour and material in certain fields.

### *Employment*

Since March of last year employment in industries other than agriculture has increased by about 8 per cent and further increases are indicated. Ever since the upsurge in activity got under way in the Spring of 1946 there has been evidence that the supply of labour was inadequate to support the volume of production that might otherwise have been achieved. The deficient supply has shown itself in acute shortages of labour in specific segments of the economy, and in a level of unemployment that is lower than what has been normal frictional unemployment in the past. On the supply side the natural increase in the labour force within the next few years is expected to be somewhat less than normal as there will be a larger proportion of the population continuing their education, fewer women seeking employment, and more people leaving their employment when they reach the customary retiring age.

Evidence of labour shortage comes to light in the inability of certain industries to meet their labour requirements, for example logging, mining, agriculture, domestic service and other work of a household nature. During the war, the Canadian worker has demonstrated a preference for urban life, for the independent living arrangements and the social contacts of the city, as against life in a small community, in an isolated logging camp or as a domestic servant. Therefore, in spite of wage adjustments that have substantially improved the relative position of the worker in these industries, shortages have persisted.

In the manufacturing industries, the expansion, diversification and shift in favour of secondary rather than primary industries involved an expansion in the demand for semi-skilled factory operatives whose skills can be fairly easily acquired. Since women are generally adapted to this work, a wider range of employment opportunities was opened to them, and with the further expansion of manufacturing, this situation is continuing. Another important aspect of the development of the Canadian industrial structure is the wider variety of skills and efficiencies now required. Extension towards the later stages of manufacture has resulted in a more complex, multiform product, requiring more elaborate marketing techniques. The requisite skills, both technical and managerial, required for this kind of work have not been sufficiently developed in Canada.

Wartime development drew attention to the service industries as areas of labour shortage and there is still a demand in this field (particularly for domestic servants and those associated with related personal services) that remains unsatisfied. There are a number of underlying forces that indicate an increased demand for the output of all service industries that is, those concerned with

health and education, recreation and amusement, as well as the personal services. The shift in population from rural to urban centres has increased the demand for all services, which in turn should have a further stimulating effect on the service industries. For example, scarcity of domestic servants on this continent in the past has been a factor in the development of household equipment industries. Similarly, a more varied and expanded range of service industries might be expected to provide a substitute for the missing domestic servant. This type of development is hampered both by lack of labour and lack of skills at the managerial level. The development of certain service industries related to recreation and amusement is of particular importance to a country like Canada whose tourist trade is a major export industry. The trend in the direction of social services, particularly health insurance, whether public or privately financed, also makes for an increased demand for workers in the service industries.

### *Technical Personnel*

During the war, an increased number of scientifically-trained personnel were introduced into industry to help speed-up production and to cope with the tremendous pressure of wartime requirements. The experiment was on the whole extremely successful and in some instances costs were reduced below those of competitor nations.

While this experience has affected the present demand for scientific and technical personnel, the demand is likely to become intensified during a period when such factors as production costs will have to be more carefully considered in meeting domestic and foreign competition than is the case at present. It should, therefore, be borne in mind, when considering present shortages, that a changeover from a seller's to a buyer's market may increase management's demand for this type of employee, and a forecast of employment needs based on present conditions in industry may be somewhat low.

The problem of shortages among technical personnel has two phases at the present time. The first concerns jobs for graduates just out of college and without experience. While the supply of graduating students this year will not be sufficient to fill the demand, a survey of job-offerings and probable graduates in applied science over the next few years shows slightly more positions than applicants. In fairness to the young people of Canada (many of whom are veterans) it is felt that jobs of this type should be kept for our own university students, although temporarily industry may suffer from a short supply of junior technical personnel. One factor, however, which may contribute to a continued shortage of junior technical personnel is the fact that it has been found that a fairly large proportion of science graduates do not use their training for scientific work but go in for administration or other phases of business activity such as banking, insurance, stocks and bonds, etc.

The situation with respect to trained technicians and scientists at the intermediate and senior level is entirely different. There is a shortage here that is increasing rather than diminishing and can only be filled by bringing more experienced persons into the country. From records kept by the Bureau of Technical Personnel it was found that the number of vacancies last year remained fairly constant but the number of technical personnel available to fill these positions have declined steadily until they have reached an almost negligible point. The Bureau has approximately 50,000 scientific and technically trained personnel on its roster. The main fields covered by this group include chemistry, physics, engineering (civil, electrical, mechanical, aeronautical, etc.), architecture, agriculture, mining, forestry, biological sciences, geology, household science. While it is difficult to forecast future needs in some of the industries, there are indications that an additional 10 per cent of the number registered with the Bureau could be absorbed immediately. The impetus



this would give to the economy would probably require a 25 per cent increase (amounting to roughly 12,000 persons) over a longer period in order to satisfy the demand for experienced scientific and technical men at the senior and intermediate level. It is felt that the admission of persons qualified in these fields would help to relieve the shortages that cannot be filled from any other source.

To sum up the employment situation, the pattern of demand for labour at present and as it appears to be emerging suggests that the domestic supply is inadequate and that the shortage tends to manifest itself in sectors important in our export trade and also in the areas contributing the less tangible elements to our standard of life. The range of jobs offering is wide, both men and women could be absorbed, and the emphasis need not fall entirely on heavy labour, particularly in view of the extreme seasonality of demand for this type of worker.

### IMMIGRATION IN RELATION TO CANADIAN INDUSTRIAL REQUIREMENTS

#### 1. *Immigration can strengthen and solidify the industrial base*

- (a) *By adding initiative and resourcefulness to industry* through the introduction of new skills, new uses for primary products, new methods of distribution, new services and new types of employment consistent with a higher standard of living. Recent experience has pointed up the shortages that exist in these types of skills. Some of the shortages will be made up by more intensive training of Canadians. Efforts are also being made to reduce the migration of these skills to the United States. But for a number of years the supply is not likely to be overabundant. The introduction of key personnel, managers, professional men, scientists, technicians, and skilled workers, with their families and dependents will provide a stimulus to the greater diversification of industry. To help maintain and expand our export trade, Canada could use men with established world connections in the foreign trade market, and export brokers to provide a link between small manufacturers and foreign buyers, or to arrange for the shipment of goods to and from countries other than Canada. The admission of managerial skills would lead to the employment of additional labour, particularly if preference were given to men who would establish industries using easily acquired skills. Contributions would also be made to industrial efficiency through the introduction of new methods of organizing production. An economically self-contained type of immigration lies in the transfer of manufacturing plants (including key managerial and technical personnel and enough skilled workers to start the plant operating). The establishment of plants for processing raw materials in new ways would result in fuller utilization of Canada's natural resources as well as increasing the number of secondary industries. New distributive skills would help to overcome our transportation problems and improve the distribution of our exports abroad. New technical skills would increase efficiency in production and would help to even out the unbalanced proportion of unskilled and semi-skilled workers in our labour market, both by increase in the actual number of skilled workers and by the training that other workers will receive through contact with these more skilled craftsmen. The experience of the refugee industries in Canada reveals the contribution that can be made by this type of immigrant. For example, two groups of forest engineers brought to this country specialized knowledge in the use of species of trees formerly considered of little commercial value. They introduced methods of drying western



hemlock and cottonwood to be made into plywood, as well as a wide variety of finished lumber products, including flooring, boxes and box shooks. Their methods of grading, trimming, loading and marketing hemlock were new to British Columbia where logging and sawmill operations had been conditioned by a seemingly inexhaustible supply of high grade timber. In Saskatchewan, a meat packing plant is curing, cooking and packing pork products by a secret process introduced to this country by a refugee. Another European brought with him a knowledge of cleaning foodstuffs that enabled him to establish a business in Canada for the efficient and hygienic cleaning of all kinds of nuts, seeds and dried fruits, thus saving money for Canadian importers, while even "waste" is re-cleaned for use as chicken feed. A kid glove business started near a depression-hit Ontario town, besides contributing to the industrial development of the town, has expanded to include goat-raising, the tanning of goat skins, the making of formerly-imported types of cheese from goats' milk. A refugee business that fills a gap in Canada's woollen industry is a combing plant for the more rapid processing of wool. Prior to the establishment of this plant, Canadian wool was usually exported for combing, while Australian and New Zealand wool went to England for sorting, scouring and combing before being shipped here in the form of tops. Using home-grown and directly imported wools, this plant now produces about one-third of the country's total consumption of wool tops.

Many more examples could be given. In many cases, the men who started these industries brought with them a few workers skilled in European methods of operation. It is interesting to note that in 1944, records show that 56 refugee industries were employing over 6,000 workers, the majority of whom are Canadians. The total number of refugees (including women and children) admitted to Canada during the war years has been estimated at only 3,500, a figure about half the number of workers in refugee-established plants. Going back to the pre-war years, the number of persons admitted from nazi-controlled countries between the years 1933 and 1945 totalled 17,869 men, women and children. Allowing at least two dependents for each worker, it will be seen that 56 industries (and this is by no means the total number of refugee industries established in Canada) were able to create enough work to take care of all the refugees permitted to come to this country.

- (b) *By expanding the domestic market.* The establishment of new industries would create an increased demand for goods and services already being produced in Canada that would be used in the manufacture of the articles produced by the new industry. Especially in our primary industries dependent on export markets, the manufacture of raw products into a greater variety of finished goods for home consumption would tend to reduce to some degree the vulnerability of our export position. There would also be less dependence on foreign markets if goods formerly imported were manufactured here in Canada. This would not necessarily mean an overall decrease in imports, for wartime experience has shown that increased industrialization has resulted in a rise in imports simultaneously with a rise in exports. This increase might be expected to continue where an expanding business economy would encourage goods brought in for re-export in new forms. Greater diversification and variety in the same volume of imports, coupled with higher levels of domestic production means, of course, a higher real standard of living in Canada.

- (c) *By increasing consumer demand* for the products and services of Canadian industry. Although this country can never be self-sufficient even a limited net increase would help to stabilize certain industries through increased purchasing power. While consumer demand is high at present, it will fall off when the pent-up demand is satisfied, unless other factors for increasing the number of buyers are brought into play. In the immediate future it is unlikely that emigration can be completely stopped and therefore immigration will be needed to assure a larger home market. If consumer demand were sufficiently extensive, cost reductions might be effected through larger-scale production. Certain overhead costs might also be reduced, such as per capita debt charges, fixed freight rates, fixed government expenditures, etc.

2. *Immigration can supply labour to fill specific shortages.*

- (a) *By filling jobs in industries where unfilled vacancies persist.*

During periods of high employment, there is always the possibility that there will be a number of jobs for which it will be difficult to find applicants in a free employment market. For example, the shortages of this nature that are being experienced to-day in the heavy industries and in domestic service might be best filled by bringing in immigrants from other countries. Critics of such a policy may point out that, owing to cyclical fluctuations or to improved working conditions and increased mechanization, there may be a surplus of labour in these very industries within few years. It is to cope with just such a situation and to take up some of the future slack, that a policy of immigration encouraging the entry of entrepreneurial skill can be of value. When applicants for unskilled labour are permitted to come into the country, admission should also be granted to men with experience in setting up new industries that will be employment-creating or stimulating to Canadian industrial expansion. By the time the labour shortages in certain fields have become surpluses, there will be new jobs for those who might otherwise be unemployed, not necessarily by transfer directly to the new industries, but somewhere in the economy. In a free labour market there will always be a certain amount of localized unemployment due to frictional causes, seasonality, changeover, etc., but the encouragement of those factors that will lead to a fairly wide variety of available jobs, along with a strong underlying demand, should provide a bulwark against extensive unemployment.

- (b) *By satisfying technical and professional shortages.*

Immigration can help fill shortages in technical personnel when it becomes apparent that the supply will not be sufficient to meet the needs of industry or to provide for the capital expansion that will have to take place in Canada. If the jobs requiring more experienced chemists or other types of scientists are not filled, it will mean a slowing-down in the scientific discovery of new products and new methods of production. Without trained engineers, the capital equipment of the country will suffer. There is at present a great deal of capital, maintenance and repair work to be done in Canada to replace the curtailed non-military investment program of the war years. New roads, hospitals, power plants, mining developments, will not take place if there are not enough technical personnel with the experience and training to carry out these projects.

*Immigration and the Problem of Displaced Persons and Refugees.*

The question of displaced persons and refugees is at present receiving a good deal of attention and it might be well to consider briefly how the admission of such groups would affect the Canadian economy. While primarily a short-term problem, it is possible that, for humanitarian reasons, a large portion of Canada's immigrants within the next few years will be taken from these groups. In view of the present buoyancy of Canadian industry, and a fairly wide range

of job offerings, it is unlikely that any great difficulty will be experienced in absorbing this type of immigrant. Only some will be suitable for heavy industry, but in the service trades and light manufacturing industries there should be openings for both men and women. On the other hand, the migration of these persons will present certain difficulties and responsibilities, administrative as well as economic. The guidance, assistance and supervision that will have to be given all immigrants upon arrival in Canada will be even more essential for displaced persons and refugees. Many may require some degree of physical rehabilitation before they can take employment. Housing accommodation will have to be found, for families as well as individuals. Some training and education will be needed to help fit them into the Canadian way of life. These people cannot be dumped on the labour market but should be supervised until employment is found for them and until they become established. Other problems that may come up would cover such points as care between periods of seasonal employment, trade union relations, eligibility for social security benefits. These points will all have to be borne in mind when setting up the administrative machinery for admitting these groups to Canada. But given a continued high level of employment and sustained production for the next few years, there should be no reason why a fair share of the displaced persons and refugees of European origin cannot be brought to Canada.

### *Conclusion: Selective Immigration*

In formulating an immigration policy for Canada the principal aim should be directed towards a more balanced economy. It should always be borne in mind that immigration cannot be isolated from the other factors affecting the economic progress of our country. It is not in itself a cure-all for all economic ills—a guarantee of greater prosperity. Nor is it the cause of unemployment and depression such as we have experienced in the past. The concept of immigration needed to-day is one that, developed in conjunction with other economic measures, will assist in the correction and prevention of those maladjustments that stand in the way of steady employment. Our present stage of development would seem to point to a policy based on a selection of suitable immigrants with training, experience, and ability to meet the requirements of further economic development. A selective immigration policy would take account of specific shortages but would at the same time anticipate future surpluses by introducing new skills to create more employment opportunities, to increase production, to introduce cost-reducing innovations, and establish new markets for finished goods. Such a policy, stressing skill and enterprise, would help to prepare the economy for the time when export credits will have expired, when there will no longer be a backlog of consumer demand, accumulated savings, or an investment program based largely on replacement and delayed capital expansion.

Selective immigration is not a restrictive policy, permitting only the entry of those who would fill persistent labour shortages. Nor is it a wide-open policy for the indiscriminate entry of unlimited numbers of immigrants who would not fit into the economic picture. It is rather a policy that sets a target consistent with the absorptive capacity of the country—a target that aims at attracting industrialists, merchants, scientists, technicians, and skilled and unskilled craftsmen best suited to industrial conditions. No fixed annual quota can be set as the figure will vary according to economic requirements. At the present time Canada is in a position to take all the immigrants, selected on the above basis, for whom transportation can be found.

Although stressing the needs of the secondary rather than primary industries, a policy of selective immigration as outlined in this brief would in no way interfere with the continued economic development of Canadian agriculture. Such a policy would encourage the migration of families, especially young people, and would not conflict with the present regulations covering the admission of agri-



culturists and workers in heavy industries, as well as the relatives of persons already resident in Canada. As an extension of the immigration policy that has been developing over the last few months, selective immigration would encourage the maximum use of Canada's resources and would form part of an integrated program for Canadian development on a national scale.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Skelton, you have presented a very complete report. Are there any questions that honourable senators would like to ask?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Mr. Skelton, you are emphasizing the importance of technicians and that type of person coming to Canada. What about the drifters, of somewhat the same type, out of the country?

Mr. SKELTON: That is a loss.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I know, but is there a considerable drift all the time?

Mr. SKELTON: Yes sir, it is one of our most serious losses.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Is there any reason you can give us for the tendency of these people to go into, say, the United States? Are the salaries more attractive?

Mr. SKELTON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Though there is a demand here for them?

Mr. SKELTON: Yes. It has certainly been the experience of technical personnel in our government that they can get two and three times the salary from American firms than what we are prepared to pay them here. That is quite a temptation.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: And they have lower taxes.

Mr. SKELTON: Yes, somewhat lower taxes.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: How is it the Americans can pay from two to three times as much as we can? What is the reason? How can they do it? We know that they have been doing it for years and years and that as a consequence we lose the youngest and brightest men in the country.

Mr. SKELTON: I think there are two answers for this, sir. One is that the Americans, with a very much larger domestic market are able to organize their industries on a mass production basis, which permits carrying higher overhead. One of the items of the overhead is a better technical staff. The second answer is—and I am ashamed to say it—that the Americans appreciate the necessity and utility of a competent trained staff more than we do and are prepared to pay for it.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: I think that is quite correct.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Mr. Skelton, you have mentioned a number of industries that have come to Canada.

Mr. SKELTON: Yes, sir.

Mr. BURCHILL: Have any of them been obliged to close up and go away? Have we lost any?

Mr. SKELTON: I believe there have been some. I think the Bata Shoe people closed some operations.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: What was the difficulty there?

Mr. SKELTON: I am not familiar with the background there, sir.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: But they left the country?

Mr. SKELTON: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I understood that they closed up and left the country.

Mr. SKELTON: I understand they closed up their main branch. There may be a small unit left, but I am not familiar with the background.



Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I am just going by the newspapers.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: That is news to me.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Possibly they find conditions such that they are returning to their own country?

Mr. SKELTON: I do not think so, sir. I am speaking from a vague memory, but I think they moved to Brazil, was it not, or to some other South American country?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: They were established in Brazil when they came here, were they not?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: When they located in Canada it was mainly for an export business. They have a large business in Central America or South American countries; or had then.

Mr. SKELTON: I can get the details of that, and I would rather do that than leave this on the record because I am not sure of what the facts are.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: I think it is information that we should have because it has a direct bearing, that is, if it is true. I have the same idea that you have, Mr. Skelton, but it is just from the newspapers.

Mr. SKELTON: May I check that and put the accurate account in the record?

(See supplementary statement submitted by Mr. Skelton at end of to-day's proceedings.)

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Skelton, if the information is correct about the Bata Shoe people, and I should not be surprised if it were, it brings into focus a problem in industrial development in this country. During the war and since the war much emphasis has been placed, not only in the high places but in the press generally, on the fact that we had changed our economy, and that we were now an industrial country. We all would like to see our industrial development expand, but I have always had a doubt as to our ability in a normal world to compete effectively with countries like Britain, the United States, and certainly Germany before the war and possibly the Germany of ten or fifteen years hence, and I feel that if we base our immigration policies on the theory that we are going to have big expansion in industrial development, I am afraid that we are on shifting sand. This country has great potential natural resources, and it would appear the part of wisdom to develop them. I have in mind, for instance, base metals that are very necessary in this present-day method of living throughout the world. In some of these things we have vast potentials, and it would appear the part of wisdom, as I say, to push our development along that line and let there develop naturally from that what further industrial processes we can develop. I think the same thing is true with regard to our wood. Canada undoubtedly to-day has a great reservoir of softwoods of a coniferous type, and the value of wood through the scientific processes that have been discovered in recent years has been tremendously increased. We can grow trees in this country just as well as we can grow wheat, oats or barley, and up to the present, at any rate, very little attention has been given to the conservation and the development of our forest products.

I fear that when it comes to a matter of keen competition, when we again get into a buyer's market that our ordinary industrial establishments may find a great deal of difficulty in competing in the export market throughout the world. I doubt the wisdom of proceeding upon a theory that we can develop our potentials in all directions and that we can compete effectively in the world markets, because we have not the opportunities for mass production that is possessed by the more highly industrialized and populated countries. To me, that has always seemed a great difficulty that had to be overcome.

There are, however, a great many smaller industries here that are not indigenous to other countries that we ought to develop; for instance, some canning establishments are being developed in Manitoba. There are other small industries of that nature, based wholly on the natural products of this country which should be developed. If we consider the textile industry, we find that all our cotton mills are dependent upon the raw material from foreign countries. I do not think it is practical for Canada to import raw cotton from the United States and develop the export market in cotton textiles and compete effectively with Great Britain, the United States or other countries who have the raw materials. I think we would have a much stronger economy if we developed the resources we have in base metals, such as copper, nickel, zinc, iron and aluminum. In the case of aluminum of course we have to import the raw material, but we have special advantages in the manufacturing process that puts us in a preferred position. If we developed these things and traded them for the things that other countries can more cheaply develop than we can, it would in the end make for a healthier economy.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: We have shown an unwillingness to admit skilled artisans and we are now laying emphasis on that. Mr. Petrik, who has one of these famous refugee firms, located in Woodstock, has complained that he is so anxious to bring out two families for his particular industry that he has set up, and which were not permitted to come, that he would be compelled to move his main factory to the United States where he now has a branch.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Senator Crerar, is it your thought that the trouble affecting a lot of industries in this country is pretty much a question of tariffs? We could manufacture many things as cheaply as other countries if we had free trade with a large population. Is that part of your argument?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Quite. If we had free trade with the United States, and with the cheap power of the St. Lawrence Valley I have no doubt that we could become a great manufacturing nation on this continent. When we will reach that happy stage, I do not know.

I should like to refer to one other remark made by Mr. Skelton. You referred to the theory that seems to be pretty general in this country, that we must not get beyond our absorptive capacity. That is a very indefinite term. I would like some skilled intellect to define it for me.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: It troubles me too.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: We hear terms like "absorptive capacity" and "standard of living" which are used rather loosely. I do not know what is meant by "standard of living", but I presume that the standard under which I grew up would be regarded to-day as a sort of semi-barbarism. I am sure that there would be misunderstood and well-intended people who would be protesting against it and trying to save me from it.

I was present and listened to the very interesting presentation by the Ukrainian delegation this morning and I think that they presented not only a fine appearance but a very intelligent brief. I recall when the Ukrainians came to Canada first—there are now something like 350,000 of them here—without capital, and went into the wilderness and hewed out a home for themselves. They built little cabins with mud floors and mud ovens to cook with. Today you can go into Ukrainian communities and find in the average home there are refrigerators and telephones, and where there is electricity there are electric lights; their farms are developed with stock and farm equipment. In other words, during the past forty years these people who came in, and who had no productive capacity except what they created themselves by their own labours, have become a very important part in the producing of the national income of this country. I think opportunities still exist, and if we limit our immigration

policy to the absorptive capacity in Canada, and take only people to whom we can give an assured standard of living, I do not think we are going to get very many on that basis.

Another point mentioned in Mr. Skelton's brief to which I would like to refer is the importance of maintaining our national income at as high a level as possible. That can best be done by developing our natural resources. Heaven knows we are going to require a high level of income, if we are to support all the social security legislation which has become so common to-day. We must have a great many taxpayers and they must be well-to-do, if we are to contribute out of the public treasury, whether federal, provincial or municipal, the sums of money required to maintain the social security program, some of which we have adopted and some of which is being contemplated.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: I wonder if Mr. Skelton would care to assume the role of a prophet for a few minutes? He mentioned something about what would happen when our loans to other countries, in the form of export credit, had been exhausted. What are we going to do then?

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: That is a thought I had in mind. Of course Mr. Skelton suggested an alternative.

Mr. SKELTON: If our loans and other measures to restore international trade do not succeed, we are going to be in an awful mess. I do not think it takes much of a prophet to foresee what will happen if our international trade is not restored.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: In other words, if Europe goes down, or takes two or three generations to recover, we are going to have a rather bad time.

Mr. SKELTON: There is no major industrial country in the world as dependent on international trade and its restoration to higher level than before the war, than ours.

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: In other words, we have got to keep on lending money.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: At one of our previous meetings transportation officials spoke about the difficulty of getting transport for the bringing in of displaced persons to this country. At that time I suggested that I thought some boats were available. I now have some information which I wish to introduce and read into the record.

The fastest and cheapest way of transporting immigrants to Canada, via North Sea Ports, is by using Victory Troop Transport ships of the War Shipping Administration, U.S.A.

These are the best ships for the purpose with excellent accommodation and quarters on all of the decks with excellent facilities for water, washing, cooking and feeding. These ships are very fast (18 knots), running expenses are small (crew of 55). They burn about 70 tons of oil per day and the cost per immigrant should be between \$80 and \$100 each.

This type of ship will carry 1,500 immigrants and the life-saving equipment exists for that number of people on each boat. Many of these ships are laid up in the Yamer River in Virginia, and can be put into use on short notice. Of course this would be a matter for the Canadian Government, who would have no difficulty, I believe, in chartering the above mentioned boats.

There has been so much discussion about not having transportation to bring displaced persons to Canada, and this looks to me to be the best and quickest method, and at least it is worth investigation. As to how many and what type of people should come, I am not in a position to say. But there seems to be some thought abroad that they should come here in de luxe transport and receive special treatment, something which we as young people did not receive. I would



like a reply to this from those gentlemen who came here representing steamship companies. They say they cannot get the transportation, that it will take years.

The CHAIRMAN: We will send it to the Director of Immigration.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Yes, and keep it on your files, please.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn until next Wednesday, at ten-thirty, when we will hear the Polish representatives. We are much obliged, sir.

(Statement subsequently submitted by Mr. Skelton:)

The Bata Shoe Company of Canada, located at Batawa, Ontario, operates three plants in this country and is planning to open a new factory in Belleville. Employment has been somewhat reduced to a current figure of over 400 workers, but will be increased when present plans for plant expansion are completed.

The committee adjourned until Wednesday, June 18 at 10.30 a.m.





1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

# Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 12

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

### WITNESSES:

- Mr. B. B. Dubienski, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Western Chairman, Canadian Polish Congress.
- Mr. Walter Dutkiewicz, Toronto, Ontario, representing Polish Democratic Association of Canada.
- Mr. B. Staniszewski, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian Polish Congress.
- Honourable Victor Podoski, Ottawa, Ontario, representing Council for Resettlement of Polish Refugees.
- Reverend R. Gordon Burgoyne, Montreal, Quebec, Canadian Manager, British Dominions Emigration Society.
- Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk, Montreal, Quebec, representing Baltic Relief Committee.
- Mr. M. G. Ballantyne, Montreal, Quebec, Editor, *The Canadian Register*, and Vice-Chairman of Baltic Relief.

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1947



## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Asetline	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

---

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 18th June, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Aseltine, Buchanan, Burchill, Euler, Haig, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Robinson, Taylor and Wilson—14.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

The Chairman filed copy of a recommendation of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, respecting immigration, adopted at the seventeenth annual meeting, Winnipeg, Manitoba, October, 1946, which was ordered to be included in the record.

The Honourable Senator Wilson filed copy of a memorandum from the American Resident Representative, Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, respecting Migration and Resettlement, which was ordered to be included in the record.

Mr. B. B. Dubiński, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Western Chairman, Canadian Polish Congress, appeared and read a brief on Immigration on behalf of the Congress, and was questioned.

Mr. Walter Dutkiewicz, Toronto, Ontario, appeared and read a brief on Immigration submitted on behalf of Polish Democratic Association of Canada, and was questioned.

Mr. B. Staniszewski, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian Polish Congress, was heard.

Honourable Victor Podoski, Ottawa, Ontario, representing Council for Resettlement of Polish Refugees, was heard in support of immigration to Canada of displaced persons of Polish origin from refugee camps of Europe, and Polish veterans from the United Kingdom.

Reverend R. Gordon Burgoyne, Montreal, Quebec, Canadian Manager, British Dominions Emigration Society, appeared and read a brief on the activities and objects of the Society.

Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk, Montreal, Quebec, representing Baltic Relief Committee, was heard with respect to immigration to Canada of Baltic peoples.

Mr. M. G. Ballantyne, Montreal, Quebec, Editor, *The Canadian Register*, and Vice-Chairman of Baltic Relief, was heard in favour of immigration to Canada of refugee people of Europe.

At 12.50 p.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday next, 25th June, instant, at 10.30 a.m.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



# MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

## THE SENATE

WEDNESDAY, June 18, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, I should first like to put on record something that I think is of importance.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce Policy on Immigration as adopted at the Seventeenth Annual Meeting, Winnipeg, Man., October, 1946.

Canada must have a vigorous immigration policy immediately. This country needs and can support a very much greater population and the present opportunity may be the last in which we can freely choose the immigrants who will fill our thinly populated country.

Canada was built by the energy, skill and initiative of immigrants and her future growth will be accelerated by bringing in those with technical and scientific skills and experience as well as those prepared for labour on the farms and in the factories. To-day as perhaps never before there are men of skill and experience with the capacities to establish new employment—creating industries, who are footloose in Europe and seeking opportunities in countries where they will be welcomed.

Canada has raw materials together with power and transportation, irrigation projects have opened up for intensive cultivation formerly waste lands and increased industrialization provides new job opportunities. Production will be increased, the standard of living raised and employment expanded if selected immigrants are encouraged to come to Canada to assist our people develop these opportunities. Canadians should think of immigration policies with confidence that, the more there is produced the more there is to share, and not on the old basis that, the fewer the people the more for each.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce urges the Government to immediately adopt a positive long-term policy of encouraging the movement to Canada of desirable immigrants from abroad. Such a policy must be based on Canada's economic needs and the maintenance of an appropriate balance between our agricultural and industrial requirements.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce recommends that:

1. The Government publicize its policy in all countries where there may be suitable immigrants for Canada.

2. The Government directly and in co-operation with experienced private agencies immediately intensify its efforts through offices abroad to recruit experienced farmers, persons with technical and scientific training and skills, and those prepared to work in a land of freedom and opportunity.

3. Federal and Provincial Governments collaborate in a program for placing immigrants in suitable locations and assimilating them into Canadian life and citizenship with its rights and responsibilities in peace and war.



Before we hear any witnesses. I understand that Senator Wilson has an important document that she would like to have placed on the record. Would it answer the purpose. Senator Wilson, if it were placed on the record without reading it at this time?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Yes. Honourable senators, I gave this document to the Chairman and he thought it of sufficient importance to have it placed on the record. It is the last report issued by the representative of the Intergovernmental Committee in Washington. These reports come to me regularly and it might be the wish of the Committee to have them.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a rather interesting document from the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. American Resident Representative, Room 330, 1344 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The document refers to what the United States, Canada and a number of South American countries have done in connection with immigration and if there are no objections the document will be placed on the record.

Hon. Senator Wilson filed a copy of a memorandum from the American Representative. Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees respecting migration and resettlement.

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON REFUGEES

American Resident Representative,  
Room 330, 1344 Connecticut Ave., N.W.,  
Washington, D.C.

### *Memorandum from the American Resident Representative—*

This issue of the MEMORANDUM reports progress to date in the movement of displaced persons and refugees under agreements signed with the IGCR. We wish particularly to call your attention to the first item, "Brazil," which reports the arrival of the first group of refugees under the agreement with Brazil.

We wish also to inform you that a Seventh Plenary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees is scheduled to be held in London beginning May 30, 1947, to consider matters arising out of the transfer of the functions and activities of the IGCR to the International Refugee Organization.

MARTHA H. BIEHLE,  
*American Resident Representative.*

## MIGRATION AND RESETTLEMENT INFORMATION

1. Brazil.—The movement of displaced persons and refugees to Brazil under the agreement between that government and the IGCR, was inaugurated with the arrival in Rio de Janeiro on May 16, 1947, of the SS. *General Sturgis* carrying 861 immigrants from the displaced persons centers in the British, American and French Zones of Germany and Austria. The ship left Bremerhaven on May 2, 1947, and had a thoroughly comfortable and successful crossing. This is the first of a series of trips which will be made by two US Army ships engaged by the IGCR for regular transportation of refugees from Germany and Austria to South America. The second ship, the SS. *General Heintzelman*, is scheduled to depart from Bremerhaven about June 1 with 850 passengers also destined for Brazil.

The SS. *General Sturgis* carried 238 families totalling 743 individuals, 117 single men, and one single woman. 69 per cent of the group were agriculturists, 26 per cent industrial workers, and 5 per cent had miscellaneous occupational

skills (tailors, bookkeepers, watchmakers, etc.). Religious affiliation was indicated approximately as follows: 45 per cent Roman Catholics, 16 per cent Greek Catholics, 30 per cent Greek Orthodox, 9 per cent Protestants. The immigrants were a young group, with 220 children under 16 years of age, and with the average age of all passengers 21 years. By nationalities the group were divided as follows: 289 Stateless, 280 Polish, 82 Lithuanian, 60 Polish Ukrainian, 56 Latvian, 45 of undetermined nationality, 24 Ukrainian, 12 Estonian, and 13 representing 5 other nationalities.

The SS. *General Sturgis* and the SS. *General Heintzelman*, which operated as troop transports during the war, have been reconverted for passenger travel. The accommodations and equipment are very satisfactory, with special arrangements for the care of children, and adequate provision for any necessary care en route.

All of the IGCR officers and the staff of the ship who had dealings with the immigrants were immensely impressed with the physical and moral quality of the persons chosen by the Brazilian selection mission, and their gratitude at the kindness with which they have been treated. Their satisfaction with the accommodation, food and general conditions provided on board ship are described as an inspiration to those who will be concerned with future moves which the IGCR will arrange.

Arrangements for disembarkation and reception and for the ultimate absorption of the immigrants into the economy of the country have been made by the Brazilian immigration authorities in cooperation with the Resident Representative of the IGCR in Brazil, who is meeting the travellers as they arrive. Most of the refugee-immigrants on this first ship will be resettled in the State of Sao Paulo.

2. Belgium.—The programme under which the Belgian Government has agreed to admit displaced persons to work in the coal mines, had brought a total of 2,431 displaced persons from the American Zone of Germany into Belgium up to May 12, 1947, in five groups moved in April and May. The IGCR has assumed responsibility for the legal and political protection of these workers until they are given opportunity for naturalization as permanent residents. IGCR officials have made two visits to the five mining districts where the DPs have settled and report that the conditions vary—in some districts they appear to be good, in others less favourable.

### 3. Canada—

(a) Liberalization of Immigration Policy.—The Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, announced in Parliament on May 1, 1947, that the Government's immigration policy is being widened. This will affect the programme under the IGCR in two ways:

(a) The "Close Relatives Scheme", which had previously been restricted to immediate family relatives, is now extended so that the term "relative" is interpreted widely enough to cover cousins and others related distantly through marriage.

(b) Qualified mining, milling and farm workers assured of employment will now be required in large numbers. One small group has already been selected for a Quebec textile plant, and two groups of workers are being selected for the sugar beet fields in Western Ontario and Southern Alberta.

In developing group movements, the Immigration Branch and the Department of Labour will determine jointly the approximate number of persons who can be readily placed in employment and absorbed in the various industries and occupations. Selection Officers will then consider applications for entry into Canada, conduct examinations of suitable physical fitness, and make arrangements for their orderly movement and placement.

(b) The Close Relatives Scheme.—Displaced persons immigrating into Canada under the "Close Relatives Scheme" have arrived from Germany. The first group of 52 refugees reached Canada on the SS. *Aquitania* on April 4 and were met at Halifax by the Resident Representative of the Intergovernmental Committee in Canada, Mr. James Colley. Documentation was speedily completed and the individuals were sent to their various destinations. A second group of 50 sailed from Europe on the SS. *Aquitania* on April 28, and a third group of 50 close relatives was scheduled to leave Europe on May 20.

The Close Relatives Scheme has been extended recently to Italy, as well as Germany and Austria, and a list of 201 eligible displaced persons has been forwarded to the IGCR office in Rome.

4. *Holland*.—An agreement has been signed between the Netherlands Government and the IGCR for the resettlement of displaced persons in Holland. It is expected that as many as 8,000 workers may be selected by the Dutch authorities in the near future in the American Zone of Germany, and that additional workers will be chosen from other zones at a later date. The agreement covers the signing of working contracts between the employers and the DPs, application for Dutch citizenship after five years, the admittance of close relatives at a later date, after individual agreement with IGCR, and responsibility by the Netherlands Government for their transportation within Holland and supervision of conditions of employment and living standards in accordance with Dutch law. If a DP is found unsuitable, he will be returned to one of the occupied zones, if the military authorities are still responsible for DPs, and the Netherlands Government will be willing to accept another DP for each person thus returned. A selection team of the Netherlands Government is at present in Germany.

5. *United Kingdom*.—A statement from the Ministry of Labour reports that, up to April 30, 1947, 2,526 Baltic women have entered Great Britain under the "Balt Cygnet" scheme for domestic work in hospitals and sanatoria, and another 1,200 DPs and refugees have entered under the "Westward Ho" scheme. It is hoped that 1,500 to 2,000 DPs and refugees will be admitted into the United Kingdom each week.

The first group of manual workers from DP camps arrived in Britain, April 21, and were mainly Balts and Ukrainians. The workers were recruited for mining, agriculture, foundries, brick-making, laundries, textiles and domestic work. It is hoped that families may be able to come later, when the workers themselves have settled down and found accommodation. The workers are engaged for a first period of one year, and will not be allowed to change their jobs except with permission of the Government. Their pay and conditions will be those of British workers in the same industries. These workers have been required to sign a declaration that they understand and accept the conditions of their employment in Great Britain. Rates of wages, details of food and clothing rationing and accommodation, and of income tax and health and unemployment contributions have been explained to them. No offer of ultimate British nationality is made.

In a discussion of plans for the immigration of displaced persons, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour on April 22 gave some information in the House of Commons on the Polish Resettlement Scheme. He stated that there were about 76,000 Poles available for work and that 6,869 had been placed in civilian employment on an individual basis. In industrial areas about 109 camps were ready to receive these workers as soon as employment could be provided for them. Farmers and country agricultural committees had been asked to apply for Poles to make up their manpower requirements. The Secretary emphasized the point that the first obligation was to recruit for employment all Poles available in the United Kingdom, since they were being maintained at the expense of the Government. He pointed out that they could make a valuable contribution to the development of British economy.



6. *Ecuador*.—The IGCR signed an agreement with the Government of Ecuador on April 21 at the Ecuadorian Legation in London. It was signed by Mr. Patrick Murphy Malin, Vice Director of the IGCR, and Senor Honero Viteri, Minister of Ecuador in London. The Ecuadorian Commission of Immigration and Colonization will present to the IGCR lists of the immigrants required by Ecuador, classified by professions, and who should be able to enter Ecuador during 1947. IGCR has agreed to undertake the cost of transport, maintenance and care of the selected immigrants from place of origin in Europe to port of disembarkation in Ecuador. The reception of the immigrants and their transport to the places indicated for their employment will be the responsibility of the Ecuadorian Commission of Immigration and Colonization in accordance with the arrangements which may be made with employers. This agreement is the result of negotiations in Quito between the Ecuadorian Commission of Immigration and Colonization and the representatives of the IGCR, Mr. Arthur Loveday and Mr. Andrew Cordova.

7. *Peru*.—The IGCR agreement with the Peruvian Government calls for listing by the Peruvian Government of the numbers of persons needed according to various categories of occupations and skills. A Selection Mission, representing the Peruvian Government, has conferred recently in London with IGCR headquarters. It is expected that the Mission will present shortly a final list of Peruvian requirements for immigrants, so that the selection of displaced persons may begin immediately.

8. *Venezuela*.—A team of Immigration Commissioners, representing the Venezuelan Government, has been selecting displaced persons in Austria for admission to Venezuela. Several of the Commissioners have moved to Germany, and plans are made for the selection of refugees also in Italy. It is expected that the first group for emigration to Venezuela will sail from Bremerhaven on June 15, 1947 for La Guaira, Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, we are rather rushed today I am afraid, and so if there are no objections I should like to call as our first witness—unless some member of the committee has another suggestion—Mr. Dubiński, who is appearing on behalf of the Canadian Polish Congress.

Hon. MR. HAIG: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before Mr. Dubiński says anything I should like to say something in way of introduction. Mr. Dubiński comes from my city. He is a member of the legal profession and he is the leading Polish representative in our whole country out West. He came to Canada in 1913 as a farm labourer. He attended the University of Manitoba and after graduation started to study law. He graduated in law in 1917 and was called to the Bar in 1918. In 1944 he was created a K.C. by the provincial government of Manitoba and thus became the first Polish lawyer in Canada to receive that distinction. If Mr. Dubiński was not himself here I would say exactly what I think of him. He is one of our very best citizens and has indeed been a great credit to the Polish people. I could go on to tell the various offices that he holds. He holds most of those that can be held in the different Polish organizations. In fact, he helped to found some of the most important. Mr. Dubiński has come down here on his own time to place the policy of the Polish people before the committee. The reason I am making this introduction is for two reasons. One, he comes from my own province and therefore I can speak of him in the very highest terms, not only of his policy but his character and of his family because I know them all; second, the Polish people have given a big contribution to the success of my own province.

D. B. DUBIŃSKI, K.C.; May I first thank Senator Haig for the very kind introduction. Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, it is indeed a great pleasure and honour for me to be given the opportunity to present the views of the Canadian Polish Congress as such an all-important problem as immigration, a problem which you have been deliberating now for some time.



Associated with me is Mr. B. Staniszewski, the general secretary of the Canadian Polish Congress, who is here to answer any questions that honourable senators may put and which I am not able to answer. I have condensed my submissions in writing and I should like to have the permission of the Honourable Chairman to refer to them.

The CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

In the course of the extensive investigation into the problem of Immigration by your Committee during the 1946 session of the Senate, the Canadian Polish Congress, as one of the many organizations appearing before you, was given the opportunity of presenting its views. At that time the Canadian Polish Congress laid a main stress on the plea of admission into Canada of former members of the Polish Armed Forces demobilized in the United Kingdom

Based on the submissions made and evidence adduced by organizations, prominent Canadians, and Government officials, your Committee issued its report on the 13th day of August, 1946. The impartial review of facts, the objective analysis of the subject and the sound conclusions drawn therefrom, make the report a most valuable record for the study of the problem under your consideration. In my humble opinion, this report is a most outstanding achievement in the history of the Senate of Canada. In this connection, I have much pleasure in extending through you, Mr. Chairman, the most sincere congratulations of the Canadian Polish Congress for undertaking such an important task. As the report shows, it has been clearly established that:

- (a) the problem of immigration is one of the most urgent problems which our country has to face in these years of post-war readjustment;
- (b) on its early solution depends the future of Canada as an economically and politically great nation among nations;
- (c) Canada can absorb a large number of properly selected immigrants—in fact a much larger number than can now be secured.

You are already possessed of a great deal of historical, statistical and scientific data, and I shall therefore endeavour not to weary you with repetitions. Should I be doing so, please bear with me. However, the truth cannot be repeated often enough until public opinion has become thoroughly acquainted with the facts. Old prejudices and preconceived ideas based on ignorance or misinformation, cannot be eradicated overnight. Despite the excellent work done by this Committee for over a year, and we believe the effect it had on the Government to take measures in enlarging the classes of immigrants to be admitted to Canada, the state of affairs right now is far from encouraging.

To our knowledge, only a very small group of immigrants from the European Continent has reached our shores in the last eight months. This fact is disquieting, having regard to the sources of proposed immigrants willing and able to come if only our Government would take the initiative to provide the necessary machinery. In many respects time is running short.

At this point I wish to share the views that the honourable chairman expressed in the record that was filed at the beginning of the session.

To many who are anxiously awaiting the green light to come over, the period of suffering might prove too long. There cannot be any doubt that a good number of displaced persons and war refugees over whose fate we are here deliberating, will be dead if we should be unable to hasten their entry to our country. To others, the years of uncertainty, frustration, and idleness will leave their indelible mark. Thus valuable human resources of which this country is in dire need, are being wasted, perhaps beyond recovery, with every minute in which decisions are deferred. Undue procrastination may well leave Canada in the backwash of the great movement, and shift of populations going on now in the world. Such movements are being channeled into definite directions which it might be difficult to change and re-divert to this country later on. Moreover,

European countries from which we have been receiving immigrants in the past are shaping policies, making it unattractive or impossible to emigrate.

As I see it, the question is no more whether there should be any immigration, but how many and what kind of people shall be admitted, and what should be done to put the general program into practice. In attempting to answer these questions, we must bear in mind that there is definitely a short term and a long term policy of immigration. We shall deal first with the immediate task ahead.

What is the situation? We are confronted with an eminently practical and concrete problem of which I believe we are able to dispose with as little theorizing as possible. At the present moment there is a considerable supply of persons who are desirous of being admitted to this country. Who these people are, has been stated in your Report of 1946 with admirable accuracy. The Canadian Polish Congress being representative of the majority of Canadian citizens of Polish extraction, is of course primarily interested in the Polish element abroad which constitutes an important portion of the total supply. We may divide them into four distinct categories:—

1. Polish war veterans in Great Britain;
2. Polish refugees in Great Britain;
3. Polish displaced persons on the Continent;
4. Polish refugees, not classified as D.P's.

Before going into detail, we may be allowed to consider in a few general terms the character and qualifications of the Polish people from which these groups of prospective immigrants are to be drawn. While there does not exist an accurate survey on the exact background of those who are ready to come to Canada, we have reliable information that they include all classes of occupations, skills, educational backgrounds, representative of the Polish people. Moreover, Canada has had in the past decades enough first-hand experience with people of the same stock on which a conclusive judgment can be formed.

There are at present about 170 thousand Canadians of Polish extraction. Over 90 thousand of them live in the Prairie Provinces, two-thirds of whom are farmers or reside in the small rural towns of our West. Another 50 thousand or so are located in rural areas or smaller towns in the rest of Canada.

These figures show that the majority of Poles in Canada add to the rural and farm population which is the strength and backbone of our country. With their high sense of loyalty and democratic ideals—with their great industry and exceptional stamina—they have played their full part in the economic expansion and in the political and cultural development of our nation. These matters have been stated before at length. However, in spite of their splendid record, we must bear in mind that they are the product of an earlier type of immigration. The Polish immigrants to Canada as we have known them in the past, did not represent a true cross-section of the skills and talents of the Polish people. The material from which we can draw to-day is of a very different kind. These Poles are no more the uneducated, partly illiterate peasants, migrating from poor and depressed territory under foreign rule. Culture does not stand still, and the Polish culture in the past decades has been developing in a direction which is much more similar to our own culture than it was forty years ago. The Poles who came before to this country had to learn how democracy works. The Poles who we wish to be admitted have lived in a republic whose form of government was modelled after the pattern of Western democracy. They have come into close contact with Western civilization. They had to make many adjustments and will find it now easier to make a few more. The Polish war veterans in particular have adjusted themselves to Anglo-Saxon forms of civilization. Many have acquired a knowledge of the English language. About 7,000 of them have married Scottish girls, and these families should find as little or as much difficulty in adjusting themselves to Canadian ways as any other families

arriving from the British Isles. Still, about 60 per cent of the Polish people in Europe are rural folk—not very different from the rural folk in Canada.

Agriculture was one of the main fields of the pre-war production in Poland. Besides grain, there were a number of specialized crops. From those the most important were sugar-beets, hops, and flax. The Polish farmer, although living and working mostly on a very small area, has had in general a great adaptability to different methods of production. A good example can be found here in Canada, where a large part of the tobacco production in the Delhi region is in the hands of Polish-born farmers, although the production of tobacco in Poland was very little known. One can, however, expect that most of the agricultural workers from Poland will be familiar with the cultivation of sugar-beets and flax.

A large part of Poland's rural population was employed in forestry. The nature of the forests in Poland was much the same type as encountered in Canada, though much more attention was given to reforestation. In the western part of Poland, almost all forests were artificially planted and scientifically managed. One can expect that, besides rugged lumberjacks, there will be also quite a supply of people skilled in the more specialized business of reforestation.

In mining, Poland was Great Britain's keenest competitor. In good years, Polish coal industry was producing up to 30 million tons of coal, with an average output per worker of 1.8 tons per shift as compared with Britain's 1.2 and Germany's 1.5. This was the highest per capita output in the Eastern hemisphere. For underground workers, the comparison was still more favourable, reaching in Upper Silesia 2.7 tons per underground worker per eight hours, as compared with 2.5 tons in Holland and 1.9 in Germany. It is needless to say that these figures show not only the high level of mechanization in the mines, but also the extraordinary ruggedness of the miners. Besides coal, the greatest treasure of the country, there was quite a substantial production of zinc and lead, potassium and rock salt. In Poland, mining was always considered a vocation, and the Polish miners migrated in thousands to the coalfields of Belgium and France and other countries including Canada. Some 160 thousand of them were working in the Western European collieries.

It would perhaps be of interest to mention the fact that the great textile industry in Poland employed before the war some 160 thousand weavers. The clothing industry employed over 20 thousand garment workers.

In other fields of industry, such as glass, ceramics, metal trades, etc., quite a substantial number of people were employed.

Many of these men and women are now in the great pools of unused labour reserves found in the D.P. camps, the Polish army camps in Great Britain, and among the mass of refugees in Europe, Africa, the Middle East and even in India. Some of them would be very useful to industries in Canada.

Poland did not only bring forth farmers and skilled labourers; with excellent schools and universities, the arts and sciences have been practised with great enthusiasm and much success. The United States have already availed themselves of a good number of Polish scientists, artists and scholars who now devote all their talents to their country of adoption, contributing much to its cultural life. Even among the Polish veterans admitted to Canada as farm labourers in the last year, there were found a very scholarly Ph.D. from Poznan University, a chemist who for years was a very active agriculturist, and a young and enterprising aircraft engineer. In the files of the Canadian Polish Congress we have enquiries from at least 30 eminent physicists, chemists and industrial engineers who desire to take employment in Canada. These then are the type of people for whose admission to the Dominion the Congress wishes to plead.



We shall now deal with these four groups separately and in greater detail:

1. War Veterans.—As to the members of the Polish Forces in Great Britain, the Canadian Polish Congress has on the 25th day of June, 1946, submitted to your Committee in detail the number of Polish soldiers, sailors and airmen who were demobilized, their educational attainments and their respective vocations prior to military service. At the conclusion of hostilities, there were about 220 thousand of them who would not or could not return to their homeland for reasons well known to you. Many of them have been ready to make their homes in Canada. But the indecision of our Government and the reluctance to remove the restrictions on immigration caused some of them to return to Poland and the remainder are undergoing training for civilian life in various camps and schools established for them by the British Ministry of Labour. About 60 per cent of them are farmers by training, over 30 per cent are skilled in the mechanical arts, and the rest represent the educational and professional classes.

Is it their fault that they have no country to set them up in civilian life as Canada does for her boys? When they were fighting on the most exposed sectors of the front near Arnheim in Holland and Bologna in Italy, Mr. Churchill put his signature to the Yalta agreement well knowing that it meant the loss of real freedom and liberty in Poland. He then announced that these boys would receive British citizenship and be allowed to settle in any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. We Canadians of Polish descent have the right to believe that the pronouncement of Mr. Churchill was made with the approval of our Government, as we have heard nothing to the contrary. We believe that this promise should be fulfilled on moral grounds alone because fulfillment of commitments has always been a British tradition. We submit also that on the basis of national self-interest, these men should be admitted to Canada.

There is another point to which we would like to draw your attention. The majority of these Polish veterans are single. It is not unreasonable to assume that they will get married as soon as they have become established. Now it is well known that about 50 thousand of our own boys have married outside of the country and have returned with their foreign brides. In view of this and of the casualties suffered during the war, an estimated 6 per cent to 10 per cent of Canadian girls in the marriageable age group would be unable to find a partner in Canada. This is an important problem which deserves full attention when immigration policies are being discussed.

So far, Canada has taken four thousand Polish veterans for farm work, but we are informed that there are at least 57 thousand more who wish to be re-established in civilian life in Canada. All of them are entitled to service gratuities payable by the British Government, and transportation expenses to any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. In addition they possess personal savings. We have reliable information that among them there are at least 2,000 who have between 4,000 to 10,000 dollars of savings with which they desire to acquire land and equipment to establish themselves on Canadian farms. Moreover, they have as much moral right as our own boys to become rehabilitated. The quota of four thousand, we trust, is only a beginning.

2. Polish Refugees in Great Britain.—This is a rather small group of specialized workers and professional men, of which only a few would like to settle in Canada since the majority of them is already either well-established in the United Kingdom or have already attractive propositions from other parts of the Commonwealth and South America. There are, however, some who could be used to better advantage in this country than in any other part of the Empire. For instance, among the 1,734 engineers and scientists in that group, there are some 171 experts in forestry, especially in reforestation, who could probably be much better used here than in England or Scotland. Many of these people feel that they could better adjust themselves to the economic and climatic conditions in this country than anywhere else, because of the similarity of climate.



Most of these people have been on British soil since 1940, and have become fully adjusted to Anglo-Saxon ways of life. Our own experience in Canada with the small group of Polish refugees admitted to Canada during the war, were most encouraging. The matter was discussed before this Committee last year. The Canadian Polish Congress thus submits that any applicant for immigration from this group should find the same consideration as other immigrants coming from the British Isles.

3. Displaced persons.—According to the UNRRA census made last fall in all Allied occupation zones of Germany, except the Russian zone, there are 850 thousand displaced persons who could not or would not go back to their places of origin. The reason is that so many of them come from the countries now included into Soviet Russia or dominated by Soviet Russia. They fear, with good reason, liquidation or forced labour upon their return to their places of origin. Almost half of these displaced persons are Poles. Their plight has been discussed repeatedly before this Committee, and we wish to express our appreciation for the statements made by such eminent experts as Lieut.-Col. Arthur J. Hicks, Miss Constance Hayward and the Reverend Ian MacKay. We heartily endorse the views expressed by the latter on the 24th day of April, 1947, when he said that the displaced persons in the area which was surveyed were people of almost every walk of life, and that there is an unprecedented opportunity to secure for our country a considerable number of people of exactly the type most needed, namely experienced farmers, skilled artisans, and industrial workers skilled in trades which are not yet properly and fully developed in this country, professional men, and intellectuals of high standing.

We should like to emphasize again that these displaced persons have undergone, and are still undergoing, so great hardships that they are ready to accept almost any kind of work and under any conditions, if only they would be given a chance to start life afresh. May we emphasize that we do not hold to the principle that the purpose of immigration is to secure cheap labour, or to depress present standards of living. There are many types of work in Canada which should be done and for which native labour cannot be found. We are convinced that the hard and exacting life in a lumber camp, a northern mining town, or on a farm which has perhaps been abandoned by its Canadian owner, will appear a paradise on earth to the majority of displaced persons, as compared with their present life—if life it can be called.

With the projected admission of five thousand displaced persons, again only a small beginning has been made considering their staggering numbers and the full extent of the problem which demands almost immediate solution.

4. The fourth group is that of Polish refugees not classified as "Displaced Persons".—The figure of 400 thousand Poles described as "displaced persons" does not however comprise the total number of Poles within the British, French, and American zones of occupation who resist and fear repatriation. There is a considerable number of those Polish soldiers and deportees who were taken during the September 1939 campaign. This also applies to Balts, Ukrainians, and other people from the Russian dominated areas, who escaped their Communist dominated countries after the deadline established for the registration of D.P's. As late as July 1946, 30 thousand refugees from Eastern Europe arrived in one single month in the American zone alone, and 67 thousand others, attempting to enter during this period, were turned back by military guards at the demarcation line. So that the exodus from the eastern portion is still going on.

These people are in a particularly difficult position, since they do not receive any help from anybody. They are living under the constant threat of forced repatriation. Of course caution is necessary in dealing with these people because of the possibility of ideological infiltration; they have not been screened by UNRRA or by the military occupational authorities; even here in Canada we have had an excellent occasion to learn about these techniques of infiltration.

All traitors, collaborators, with the totalitarians, whether brown or red, agents of secret police, regardless of whom they serve or served, should be rejected. But there are thousands of decent and well-deserving men and women in this group who have been deprived of all civil rights, even of the precarious status of a D.P. by UNRRA policymakers.

(B) After having discussed the immediate supply of prospective immigrants to Canada, and having made a few summary suggestions as to their treatment, we may now turn to some aspects of our long-term policy of immigration.

It seems to be a sound assumption that the present large supply of applicants for immigration to Canada is but temporary. As soon as the immediate problems of post-war readjustment are solved, and the great numbers of refugees and displaced persons either absorbed or otherwise disposed of, there is little prospect of large scale migrations. If long-term predictions were at all possible, it would appear as a safe guess that the tide of East-West movements of people is about to subside, if not to be reversed. The rate at which the white race has been growing in the past century and a half is on the decline. Great Britain, France, and other European countries are making great efforts to secure all the manpower they can muster. In the past, Canada's largest reserve of immigrants, however, was in Central and Eastern Europe. This part of the Old World has now fallen under a regime whose decided policy it is to retain all its available human resources in order to strengthen its own economy and military position, instead of adding to the potential of other countries. Your Committee has had an opportunity to judge the effects of this policy in all-Soviet-dominated countries from the testimony of the representatives of the Canadian Czecho-Slovak and Canadian Ukrainian organizations. All these factors taken together suggest that, in a few decades, there will be no more population surplus in Europe, and no more migration to the New World. It may well be that this is the last chance when Canada is able to secure for herself the much-needed steady flow of immigrants from the Old World through a far-sighted and courageous long-term programme of immigration policy.

In the limited time at my disposal, it is of course impossible to outline such a programme in all its detail. That it is imperative may be shown by drawing your attention to two or three more specific questions.

The problem of immigration has not only an economic aspect, which so far has been in the foreground of your deliberations, but also a sociological aspect. It is of equal, if not greater importance for the happiness of the individual and the welfare of the nation. The sparse population of our prairie provinces, for instance, is directly responsible for many discomforts and maladjustments under which their present population has to suffer. We must not principally think in terms of shortages in domestic and agricultural labour which implies hardships for the farmer and his family, and also for older people who deserve to be relieved of some of the heavy work. A sparse population means also that many services, such as schools, health, transportation, electricity, recreation, etc., are difficult to obtain or are insufficient and far too costly.

Moreover, a denser population would open many new opportunities for more specialized types of occupation. With a larger population and a greater division of labour, the cultural standards in general are bound to rise. It would be possible not only to sustain more artisans, but also more artists; not only more technical specialists, but also more men of letters and learning. Amenities of life, which are now far beyond the reach of so many of us—symphony concerts, ballet, dramatic art, etc.—could then much more easily be secured.

Coming from the western provinces, I wish to emphasize that we are envying you gentlemen from the east who can enjoy much more than we can. I have reference now to the symphony concerts, ballets, dramatic art, and so on.

Today the prairie provinces have great difficulties in providing adequate high schools of the composite type and vocational training. Scattered habitat, small number of people in one area, insufficient local means to secure appropriate facilities for any community effort and the much-needed community centres, contribute much to the unsatisfactory, often drab, life in our rural districts. This in its turn causes young people to leave the farm for the city, and adds to the present problems of our agriculture.

If Canada wishes to become a great nation, not only in terms of material wealth, she will have to keep up the noble values of Western civilization whose guardianship is gradually slipping from the tired hands of Europe. She can only do so if her population is large enough to sustain and give resonance to men and women who devote their genius to the higher values of culture. The United States has already gained a considerable advantage over us in this respect. This is due not only to her larger population, but also to immigration of Old World talent, while Canada's restrictive measures have so far largely excluded a similar influx. We must not complain if our young physicists, artists, writers, and scholars, are continuously drawn to the United States, as long as we do not take the necessary steps to provide for them scope and sustenance in our own country. Again, much depends on our population and immigration policies.

It has been said that Canada has not really gained in population by past immigration movements. It is said that about as many emigrants were lost to the United States as have been gained from overseas. Although this is quite true, there is nothing to prove that Canada would not have suffered the same losses if there had not been any immigration at all. Mr. Mosher and others appearing before this Committee have suggested that European immigrants have proportionately partaken into this exodus to the United States. Where does he get the facts for his contentions?

As far as we are aware, no special study has ever been made on the subject. All we know for sure from an as yet unpublished survey, is that the Mennonites, for instance, who have come to Canada, and their descendants, have shown no tendency to emigrate to the United States. They have rather spread westward and northward into regions as yet uninvaded by Anglo-Saxon Canadians at the time.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And South America, some of them, some of the Mennonites?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, Honourable senators, I mentioned them because Mr. Mosher cannot prove that the Canadians of Central European stock are drifting out of our border. It is true some of the Mennonites have gone to Peru, Paraguay and Chihuahua, which is a general demonstration of protest to an assumed or imaginable infraction or offence against the promises that they were given in 1872. However, Mr. Mosher, representing organized labour, wishing to argue why immigrants should be restricted, used the argument that we are getting no more in than we are losing to the United States.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is that true?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Well, the statistics show that Canada has lost a terrific number.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I know, but I do not think that as many went to the United States from Canada as this country has obtained from other countries.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I am sorry, sir, but I think the statistics will show that, whereas we got in the last thirty years five million people, these five million have moved to the United States, so that it is a very strikingly large number, and it is an extremely important question that should be studied.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Just a moment. You would not say that the five million that came was the same five million that went out?



Mr. DUBIENSKI: No, but that is the over simplification of the argument. He says, "Why bring five million people into Canada when five million go to the United States?"

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Was it not Mr. Marshall that argued that?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. At a previous meeting here we were given figures to show that out of every 100 people who came to Canada, ninety-one went to the United States. They were not the same people that came to Canada, but ninety-one Canadians or immigrants went to the United States for every 100 people that Canada secured by immigration. That will be found in the records of a previous meeting.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I wish to argue that Mr. Mosher has made a statement which may be misleading and damaging for the deliberation which we are now dealing with, because the average Canadian says, "Well, if the Central European . . . ." let us say a Ukrainian or Pole "comes here and is simply using Canada for a training ground for American endeavours, why allow that? It is at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer". But, that is not correct. We can show that not two per cent of the Central Europeans come here for just those intentions. He is usually an agriculturist who gets so attached to the land that no matter how difficult his work is he remains on the spot where he is.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): How do you know that Mr. Mosher is not right?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: That is very easy, sir. Just study the statistics of the U.S. immigration.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What proof have you that the people who come in are not the same people who go to the United States?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: American restrictions prove that. A Pole born in Poland comes under a quota, and he cannot get into the Polish quota without difficulty, or the Russian quota, or the Czechoslovakian quota if he is Russian or a Czech-slovak, because those quotas are very small. He can never get out. He is practically excluded.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is he still regarded as a Pole or Ukrainian although he is a naturalized Canadian?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, that is absolutely so. U.S. immigration regulations have a quota system. For instance, the annual quota of Poles, say, is 27,000 per year. This quota is exhausted by Poles from Poland before a Canadian of Polish extraction can apply. Although he is a Canadian citizen now, if he was born in Poland, he is still regarded as Polish.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be a mistake if we did not put the figures of Herbert Marshall, the Dominion Statistician, on record here. He states that from 1871 to 1941 6,305,885 people immigrated to Canada, while from the same period 5,838,635 went out of Canada.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I think that would be more informative and more useful if you did not go back so far. Is the same tendency and the same proportion shown in the last ten or fifteen or twenty years?

The CHAIRMAN: We can give it from 1911 or 1921.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I would sooner have it given from 1921.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: 1941 would be the last date.

The CHAIRMAN: From 1921 to 1931: 1,198,105 people came to Canada while during the same period 1,094,636 people left.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Have you the figures from 1931 to 1941?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Of course the immigration would be very small.



The CHAIRMAN: Yes. In that period 149,461 people came to Canada and 261,699 left. In other words, more people left Canada than came to this country.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Have you any idea if those were native-born Canadians?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Dominion Statistician did not give those facts, but I presume that could be analysed.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: When Mr. Marshall was before the committee I tried to question him as to where these people who left Canada had lived in this country. I asked him about the movement out of the maritime provinces, but he did not have the figures from any particular part of Canada. You could not tell from what part of the country they were moving in the largest numbers.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: They had a heavy movement from Quebec to England.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think there is one point that ought to be cleared up. Anybody who knows anything about the practice of immigration from Canada to the United States knows that what the speaker says is correct. The quota system applied to everybody except native-born Canadians or native-born Mexicans. That is positively clear. A practising lawyer in Winnipeg knows that you have a good deal of it there. They do not let anybody in except that class. In my experience I have found that the class that goes to the United States mostly consist of people that have got a good education and are from twenty to thirty years of age.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: A tremendous amount of that class of people are going over there. It is not a labouring class but it is a class that hope to get a better position in the economic life of that country because there are more opportunities there than there are in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think that condition will always exist.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Shediac): What is the percentage of Communists in your people?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Does the honourable senator mean among Canadians of Polish extraction?

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Shediac): Yes, the people you are supporting.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I would say a very, very small number. It may be very vociferous, but it is a very small number. Those who want to come here are not Communistic. That is why they want to come here. That is also why the Communists want to keep them out of here. They want them to return to communist-dominated countries whereas we want to bring them here because they are fleeing from communistic countries.

The CHAIRMAN: In other words: Short and few.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Shediac): That is very important.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Communists do not consider Canada as a communistic haven.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: So they might think that a little leaven might leaven the whole lump.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I have endeavoured to show that Central Europeans are not those who are leaving the country.

It seems reasonable to assume that all rural immigrants from the Continent have behaved in a similar manner in this respect. In view of the largely rural character of the Poles and other Eastern European immigrants of the past, it seems safe to assume that their tendency to emigrate to the United States has been inconsiderable in the past, and is till of little importance.

There is still another point which demands careful consideration if one speaks of immigration.

Just before leaving the city of Winnipeg I had the experience of hearing Mr. Trygve Lie, the general secretary of the United Nations Organization, with regard to the dangers of another war and so on, and in spite of it, the Canadian Polish Congress takes a much more realistic view on that point, which I will deal with in a very few minutes.

However great our desire for peace and for the unity of nations may be, it would be folly not to reckon with the stark realities of international relations. For the first time Canada's vast arctic frontiers have been made extremely vulnerable by the progress of modern technology and recent changes in world affairs. Quite apart from the military aspect, of which I am not qualified to speak, history teaches us that empty spaces and undeveloped resources cannot be protected forever against the steady pressure exerted by the population overflow and the desires of less privileged nations in other parts of the world. The only permanent way to prevent violent eruptions is some form of equalization between poor and densely populated countries, and rich and sparsely populated countries. The movements of goods and capital must be supplemented by the movement of human beings, in order to secure a sound international equilibrium which removes the sources of possible conflicts and makes for a peaceful co-operation on a world-wide scale.

#### *Method of Selection of Immigrants*

Finally, a few words appear to be in order as to the methods by which immigrants should be selected and integrated into Canada's social and economic pattern. It has been repeated time and again, and we agree, that in the past the whole matter has been handled in a rather unscientific and haphazard manner. An immigration law that your Committee has rightly called an Act of Exclusion rather than of Immigration, has made it possible from time to time, by measures called Orders-in-Council, for certain exclusive categories of immigrants to be admitted, under pressure from without instead of by the planned initiative of the Department. There is no wonder therefore, when criticisms—though often unjustified—are levelled against the administration for allowing transportation companies or other organizations, and even private persons, to initiate movements of immigrants into Canada.

A recent case in point is the admission of one hundred Polish girls to be employed in a textile plant. In this matter as well as the matter of the four thousand Polish war veterans, it should be noted that they have not been brought into this country as actual immigrants, but under the auspices of the Department of Labour, in order to alleviate an emergency due to labour shortage.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, whether I make it clear, but I say that our immigration policy is one of passing the buck.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Every time a little group is allowed to come in, instead of the Department of Immigration taking any responsibility, it shifts it to the Department of Labour, and it gets all the blame. When we hear of a hundred Polish girls coming in, the Department of Immigration is taking no responsibility.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: They are immigrants, even though they have been brought in by the Department of Labour and not by the Immigration Department.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I am asking why does not the Department of Immigration take the full responsibility for them? Mr. Jolliffe will say that they are not in the right category as immigrants; they are in Mr. MacNamara's Department. I think Canada has grown big enough, and that we should have enough courage to say not only to our own people but to the world at large what is Canada's

immigration policy. If we have no policy, let us know it. This situation has an unfortunate psychological effect on the people who are waiting admission; they want to know where they stand. The Department of Immigration always comes to the House of Commons with an apology; they say, "just leave those 4,000 Poles, and don't criticize us; we are just filling a hole there and covering a patch here". Thus, even this much advertised but very insignificant influx cannot be credited to the proper Department responsible for immigration.

The Canadian Polish Congress believes in the necessity of the adoption of clear-cut and non-ambiguous principles in the selection and admission of immigrants. Nothing perhaps in the whole history of immigration into this country was more unjust and more harmful to national unity than the fallacious concept of race and of preferred and non-preferred nations. This anthropological fallacy, based on popular and entirely non-scientific beliefs, thwarted the progress of integration of a considerable part of our population, and developed a bitter feeling of discrimination and an inferiority complex which made the victims more susceptible to all kinds of subversive and anti-Canadian propaganda of class hatred.

We all know how the population of Canada stands. Someone says, "You cannot come in because you are from the Balkans; we are going to get a Swede or a Norwegian—they are preferred—or a German because he is preferred to a Pole", and so on. That policy has had a tremendous psychological effect on the population of Canada. They feel that some are preferred to others, and that some must be inferior and others superior; in turn the foreign classes are separated into communities, sort of social islands within Canada.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Would you put all races on the same basis for immigration purposes?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: There is one test for immigration and that is, irrespective of where an immigrant comes from, if he suits the needs of the country—that can easily be determined—he is acceptable. For instance, if we work on a budget basis, and say that we need 10,000 farmers, and 2,000 artisans, irrespective of where they come from if their health, intelligence, capacity for assimilation and integration and personal integrity is acceptable, it matters not whether the person is from Poland, Norway or from Iceland. If an immigrant fits into the programme of our country, and it is in our interests to have him here, I see no reason for branding him as a Ukrainian or a Swede.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I agree with you on that point, as far as the white races are concerned. But would you apply that policy—this may be suggesting discrimination—to the coloured races as well?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I am now speaking of the European source of immigration.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I am inclined to agree with you on that.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I do not think that our needs in the whole social and political structure have so far advanced that we should consider immigration from Asia as an immediate problem. I think that within a decade or so it will not be a problem, because those peoples are developing their own social and political life. Our trouble is an immediate one, because so many people have no homes to go to. Canada has only recently put the last stamp of approval on full nationhood giving distinct Canadian citizenship, and yet we are so far behind in our expression of a proper immigration policy, which is so all important.

Any method of screening which tends to form groups of people on the basis of racial or class distinctions is unwholesome and has to be abandoned. The newcomer has to feel that he has an open way to equal opportunities, and that he is not treated as an inferior, irrespective of the country of his origin. On the other hand, the members of the Canadian Polish Congress recognize the fact that there are certain things which make the integration of an immigrant



into our national pattern of life impossible, and which make the admission of certain people dangerous for our democratic system. We are of the opinion that a test of loyalty and democratic integrity should be regarded as an essential condition for the admission into our country, and that this test should be applied to everybody, regardless of his origin, social position, race, or name. We think that this is much more important than a means test or birth certificate.

In this connection, we would like to state that we do not share the opinion represented before this Committee by some of the witnesses, that the displaced persons and war refugees should be divided along national or racial lines. We think it is most inappropriate, for instance, to divide the displaced persons, almost all of a very similar background, according to nationality, race, or creed labels. In general, all of them come from neighbouring countries of a very similar structure and history; they all found themselves in the displaced persons camps due to the same forces of destiny, and they refused to return to their respective countries because of their common belief in our democratic and Christian ideals. To select one group of them as more desirable than another because of race or creed, as is sometimes advocated, would be in our opinion not only unreasonable but also unfair. Therefore, our plea for admission to Canada of displaced persons is inclusive of the Balts, Ukrainians, and Yugo-Slavs who can satisfy the test suggested by us.

In the opinion of the Canadian Polish Congress, there are only two factors by which the application of any applicant for immigration to this country can and must be judged: On the one hand, his personal qualifications as to democratic thinking, moral integrity, physical and mental health, character and intelligence. On the other hand, the needs of Canada herself as to the occupational classes of people necessary to maintain a balanced economy.

In the latter respect, however, we may state that the self-interest of any particular group, however vociferous its demands may be, do not necessarily reflect the best interests of the country as a whole. It is the mandate of a democratic government to safeguard the common good of the nation.

Now, it obviously would be for the good of Canada as a whole not to reject classes of workmen and professionals from abroad whose efficiency and special skills hold out every promise to add substantially to our productivity, even if they should in some cases displace native holders of jobs who have been less efficient and successful in their performance. If they are less efficient or mediocre is it not in the interest of the country to bring people here who will increase competition and raise the standard of the labouring classes. It is not the duty of a government to protect people against every kind of competition and thus remove the stimulus to rise above mediocrity. That so far, farmers have been almost the only large class who were not barred from immigration, seems to be mainly due to the fact that our Canadian farmers have been either less jealous of their prerogatives than other classes, or they have had less active pressure groups and lobbies at their disposal.

Hon. MR. EULER: Except the makers of butter.

Hon. MR. McDONALD (Shediac): May I ask a question? Supposing four or five thousand agriculturists are brought to Canada, can they go on to the farms, and leave to go to the city the next day? What are the regulations in that respect?

MR. DUBIENSKI: I would scarcely think that possible. First of all, these men are farmers and are clamouring for land to settle on.

Hon. MR. McDONALD (Shediac): Is there any restrictions upon these men who come out as farmers to do anything else they like?

MR. DUBIENSKI: That is a point on which the Department of Immigration should formulate a policy. For instance, we need so many farmers and we have the land to settle them on; the immigrants from Central Europe should be told



that they will not get their naturalization papers or their citizenship qualifications unless they have satisfied the government that they have complied with their undertakings before coming to Canada. They would be required to come here as farmers, to settle on the land for a five-year probationary period; if they can satisfy the Department of Immigration that due to physical health or otherwise their good intentions could not be carried out, that is a different question.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (Shediac): But what are the regulations in that respect to-day?

The CHAIRMAN: It is all a question of proper government supervision after the immigrants come here.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I asked that question of Mr. Jolliffe when he was before the Committee some weeks ago, as to whether men could come in, as Senator McDonald suggests, as farmers and after a month of two leave the farms and go into the cities to work in the factories. I inquired as to whether those persons would be followed up and compelled to return to the farm. I think you will agree with me that Mr. Jolliffe said that as a matter of practical procedure it was impossible to follow them up, that nothing much could be done about it.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I would disagree with Mr. Jolliffe if he said that nothing could be done about it.

Hon. Mr. EULER: He did not say that nothing could be done, but that as a practical measure they could not do very much about it.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not done.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: It is not done.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I agree with him.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: Was there not an agreement with the Polish soldiers who came from Italy to stay on the land as farmers for at least two years?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, and they are being very strictly supervised in that respect by the Department of Labour; they have to stick to it, because there is always the danger of deportation. I am glad to hear that there has been no case where we had to deport, and it is almost a year, or more now. To off-set the evils involved in the exclusion of certain classes from immigration and secure a more balanced immigration which would be for the real good of the country, the matter of selection should not be left to arbitrary regulations of the department and political wire-pulling.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, there are two or three thoughts which I should like to leave with you, that in order to obviate criticism in the House that this man brought so many people in and this corporation so many more, and that there are persons who are acting as lobbyists who are really shaping the immigration policy, rather than the Department, that the department should be assisted by an advisory board representing labour and management.

It has been suggested that an advisory committee should be attached to the Department. This is an excellent idea. The Department needs the co-operation of experts in the field, of economists and sociologists, of the representatives of the various industries, all industries, and of the unions and organizations of employees, farmers, professionals, etc.—in short, of a representative body of all classes and groups in Canada.

But an advisory committee is not enough. Under the present law, the administration has almost unlimited powers, either to refuse or admit any individual immigrant, even if he should fall under one of the few categories whose admission is theoretically possible. Although a man under the present regulations comes within a certain category as provided under the orders in council, the immigration branch can just exclude him without any recourse, because the only recourse is to the Minister, and the Minister, again, is the

superior of the man who refused him. So there it stands. The same Department is deciding who listens to the appeal. For me as a lawyer this looks like an extraordinary situation in a democratic country.

As I say, an immigrant once rejected by the Department of Immigration may appeal to the Minister who is the immediate superior of the head of that Department.

This state of affairs is undemocratic and intolerable. There ought to be an impartial board of review or appeal to check the decisions of the administration. Although as a lawyer I am naturally in favour of judicial tribunals, in this case I would concede to a board composed in a similar way as the advisory committee mentioned above.

We must keep the law to a certain extent elastic, but it must be supplemented by the binding decisions of an impartial and non-political body of representative citizens who in their entirety reflect the commonweal of the whole democracy. The recently instituted Income Tax Board of Review might serve as a model for a similar board in the field of immigration.

Hon. Mr. EULER: It is not instituted yet.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. EULER: The Income Tax Appeal Board is not instituted yet.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, but I think it is a thought which would take it out of political wire-pulling.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I think you stole that thought from the report of the Income Tax Committee, because we are hoping yet to get that through.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Yes, but I think it is an idea, for what value it may have, that immigration will be a political football so long as we do not have an auxiliary board which works with the Department. There should be either an auxiliary or advisory board composed of non-political, impartial, responsible men; and then, if the Department says to Mr. Jolliffe, "Yes, you can bring 100 Polish girls in for Mr. Dionne," all these discussions to-day in the House of Commons would not be going on, because on that board would be a man representing labour, another representing industry and management, and the commissioner would have given his signature with the approval of the Department. Now, because the Department does it, a political party grabs the incident as a splendid argument to keep the House of Commons going on something which is probably wholly unjustified, because here we have 100 Polish girls who have been taken out of a condition of hell, and they are happy to be here. Why this argument? Why waste the time of Parliament on a point which is so obvious?

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Sir. Proceed.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: In fact, immigration is of such importance to Canada, that it deserves a separate Department, with a responsible Minister at its head, and not simply a branch of another Department.

In conclusion, may we add that the task of the authorities and the public does not end with the legal admission of an immigrant to this country. The problem of immigration is closely related to that of integration of the newcomers into the economic and social life of the nation.

As has already been mentioned, there is one other matter which is very important. Once the immigrant comes here he must be looked after or supervised during a certain period, which you can call a probationary period.

In the case of immigrants who have been sponsored by relatives or intimate friends, the process of absorption is largely taken care of. In other instances, however, an adequate machinery should be set up to help them along, to supervise them for a probationary period of say five years, after which time they may be expected to have become fit not only to receive Canadian citizenship, but also to live among us as one of us.

So far, the field officers of the Department of Immigration have done some of this work, but only to a limited extent and with little, if any, psychological and sociological training for this very precarious task. The results of their endeavours have not been very encouraging.

It seems to be only reasonable that a form of supervision should be exercised over all new-comers for their time of probation and initiation, along the lines applied to all citizens of Canada by the Selective Service during the war. An experienced staff for this task should still be available.

As to the psychological needs of the immigrant who is without relatives and intimate friends in this country, this seems to be the field where in our opinion much could and should be done by the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State, our social, charitable, and service organizations—to extend a friendly hand to those who will later become our co-citizens and compatriots. There should certainly be close co-operation between these organizations and the authorities in charge, which might even find some form of legal basis.

Respectfully submitted.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dubienski.

Hon. Mr. EULER: May I make a comment or so, and perhaps ask a question. Taken by and large, I agree almost entirely with what Mr. Dubienski has said. I agree with him that there should be no racial discrimination, and I am, generally speaking, quite sympathetic to the carefully selective immigration of Poles as well as other European people. I say that because in my own district, in the city of Kitchener—as my honourable friend from Winnipeg usually speaks of “his” city of Winnipeg so I speak of “my” city of Kitchener—we have, as I suppose you know very well, a good many hundreds of people of Polish extraction, and even of Polish birth. They are just as good citizens as we have, and for that reason I am quite sympathetic to his people. But he made one statement here with which I do not quite agree. He has four categories, and he discusses the first one on page 11, I think, that consisting of the Polish veterans to the number, I believe, of 220,000.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Originally. There are now only about 57,000.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And then he refers to the Yalta Agreement. Perhaps I can quote it. He says, “Mr. Churchill put his signature to the Yalta Agreement well knowing that it meant the loss of real freedom and liberty in Poland”. I don’t know anything as to that. “He then announced that these boys would receive British citizenship and be allowed to settle in any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations”. That is the point I want to make. I do not see how Mr. Churchill would have any right, moral or otherwise, to make any commitment so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned, and particularly with reference to Canada. Then you say: “We Canadians of Polish descent have the right to believe that the pronouncement of Mr. Churchill was made with the approval of our government, as we have heard nothing to the contrary. We believe that this promise should be fulfilled on moral grounds alone because fulfilment of commitments has always been a British tradition.” Would you say that because the Canadian government did not disavow what Mr. Churchill said—if indeed he did say that—these people should be admitted to any part of the British Commonwealth? Would you say that merely because the Canadian government did not disavow that we are bound, pledged to the fulfilment of what he may have said? I would not agree with that.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Well now, may I go this far, Mr. Senator? This was done when the war was at its height. I think the situation was not very encouraging. As you will admit, just at the time of the Yalta Agreement, the crisis was ap-



proaching, and it was very necessary, for some reason—at least in the opinion of Mr. Roosevelt—to sort of pacify Mr. Stalin. Mr. Churchill represented not only Great Britain but he represented the British Allied Armies.

Hon. Mr. EULER: So far as local policy is concerned?

Mr. DUBIENSKI: No, I mean the problem of winning the war.

Hon. Mr. EULER: We are talking about immigration now.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: I am sorry. I am trying to answer the point which you have raised. Now, all we Canadians must assume that he spoke at Yalta not only for England, because the Canadians were not represented at Yalta, as far as I know, either by a strategist or a politician or a statesman. Was Canada represented at Yalta? Was anyone there to speak on behalf of Canada? No; Churchill spoke for the British Commonwealth.

Hon. Mr. EULER: So far as the war is concerned. I am not sure about that, even, but we will say that.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: He went and put his signature to that agreement. He comes back and makes an announcement in the House of Commons in London, in the presence, I assume, of every diplomatic representative, including Mr. Vincent Massey.

Hon. Mr. EULER: He could not speak there.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: Who could not?

Hon. Mr. EULER: Mr. Vincent Massey.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: No; he occupied one of the diplomatic loges in the House of Commons. But Mr. Churchill made a pronouncement on behalf of the British people as to what the Yalta Agreement consisted of. We should have known then and there that the Canadian government did not put its signature to an agreement which bound the Canadian Forces as to the agreement or the method of the further prosecution of the war. But nothing was said to the contrary. And in connection with the Yalta Agreement he says, in so many words, "We have sold Poland down the river. But we have a consolation for the poor boys; we will take them in, make them British subjects and settle them within the Empire". There was no press, government or any other pronouncement to the contrary; and here we are, still waiting for it to be carried out.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I may agree with you to this extent, that Mr. Churchill might make a commitment—I am not so sure of that, though he certainly could make a commitment on behalf of Britain itself—so far as the conduct of the war is concerned. But when you come to the point that Mr. Churchill there was speaking for all the British Commonwealth, to the extent that he could pledge this country, Australia, or any other British Dominion to admit as immigrants any people, I think that is going entirely too far.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, let us take it to the court. We are much obliged to you, Mr. Dubieniski.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I just wanted to correct that point.

The CHAIRMAN: We are in a hurry. There are bound to be differences of opinion all the time.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And when I say that, there is no prejudice whatever in my mind against the Polish people.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you are right—if we had time to go into it.

Mr. DUBIENSKI: May I apologize for the length of time I have taken?

The CHAIRMAN: Don't mention it, sir. Are there any other representatives of Poland here?

Mr. WALTER DUTKIEWICZ: I am just reporting that I represent the Polish Democratic Association.



Hon. Mr. HAIG: Are you going to speak?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: I have a brief, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the brief lengthy?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: No, it is a page and a half only.

The CHAIRMAN: We are rather rushed, and we have taken an hour and a half already. You go ahead.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators,—

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Just a moment. Whom does this gentleman represent?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: I will announce myself in one second. My name is Walter Dutkiewicz, and I represent the Polish Democratic Association. I was here, as you remember, one year ago.

The CHAIRMAN: To put it shortly,—are you communistically inclined?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: No. We are a big organization composed of all kinds of people; many Catholics, many Protestants, and all kinds of people.

The CHAIRMAN: All right; proceed.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: I wish to thank this committee for honouring us with an invitation, and now I will read a brief which has been prepared by the National Committee of the Polish Democratic Association.

About a year ago, our representatives had the honour of asking this committee for a more liberal immigration policy. We believed then, and we still believe, that this great country of ours can become still greater and richer by absorbing new Canadians and by allowing those who are already here to bring their families and relatives into the country of their adoption.

First, let us say that we fully appreciate the steps that the Federal authorities have already taken in this direction. Indeed, we are happy to agree that the immigration policy has been somewhat liberalized. We do recognize that the Order in Council P.C. 371 of January 30, 1947 provides for the admission of many relatives previously excluded by our old immigration laws, and is undoubtedly a step forward. Canadian representatives have been sent to many countries of Europe, including Poland, in order to facilitate on the spot any legal formalities required for immigration. Special credit is due to this committee for its fine work in bringing the immigration problems and the need for a definite policy to the attention of the Government and the public.

Yet, we are bound to say that while the Order in Council of January 30, 1947 goes a long way, it does not, in our opinion, go far enough. A man who has settled in Canada is still not allowed to bring here his married son, his daughter if she is over eighteen years of age, a married brother or sister, or an orphan niece or nephew if he is over sixteen. Thus, we respectfully urge the government to broaden and liberalize further its immigration policy to include those relatives mentioned, for whom at present the doors of Canada are still closed.

2. War Refugees.—Immigrants are, and will be coming from the Displaced Persons' Camps in western Germany. Some of them will be Polish men and women. On behalf of them, we would like to present two recommendations:

- (a) Let them come into our free country as free men and women. Their sufferings are beyond any imagination, and therefore no one must be allowed to take advantage of their present misery to impose degrading and unjust conditions as the price of their admission to our shores. We all know that any price, no matter how heavy, will be paid willingly by these unfortunate victims of war and political strife in Europe. But our honour as a great nation must not be soiled by private entrepreneurs who pick the choice pieces from bargain counters of human

misery. Moreover, we submit, if we admit to Canada immigrants whom we restrict in the liberties which we ourselves enjoy, then we endanger not only their freedom but that of all Canadians as well.

Hon. MR. EULER: Are you referring there to the Dionne case?

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: That is exactly right; and to the soldiers. I shall have more to say about that in a second or so.

The government must supervise immigration, acting in accordance with our international obligations, and our national honour and our tradition of liberty.

(b) Great care must be taken so that no Nazi collaborators are permitted to enter Canada. It is well known that thousands of little quislings from may lands are remaining in western Germany. They are trying now to gain our sympathy by displaying their hatred of Russia. Anti-communism must not be honoured as the certificate of a democrat, for we should remember that this hate-Russia song was, and still is, the national hymn of every Nazi.

3. Abolish the Terms of Two Years Farm Labour for the Members of the Polish Army.—During the last six months, Canada has accepted 4,000 soldiers of General Anders' army. It is regrettable that a political issue was made of their confusion and their unwillingness to return to Poland. Yet still more regrettable are the conditions of their admission. A two-year farm-labour term was imposed upon them with a threat of deportation held as a whip over their heads.

These veterans of the last war, who fought our own battles in Africa and Italy under British command, do not deserve such treatment. Let them come to a free land as free men. Let the government free them from their two year servitude! By such a noble act, it will gain the gratitude and loyalty of these future citizens of Canada.

Respectfully submitted,

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,

POLISH DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATION.

The CHAIRMAN: You believe in freedom then, do you?

MR. DUTKIEWICZ. I disagree with statements made previously, sir, that restrictions should be put on a man coming here to tie him to the land or to other forms of making a livelihood. I do not think that is consistent with the concept of liberty.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you believe that he has the right to decide whether he goes back to Russia or to Poland?

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: I believe that a man should have a right to decide whether he wants to be a storekeeper or a farmer.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think that he has the right to go back to whence he came?

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: I do not think there is anyone who disagrees with that.

The CHAIRMAN: You agree that he ought to have the right to exercise his judgment?

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: I think we all agree.

Hon. MR. EULER: You do.

MR. DUTKIEWICZ: We have no legal or any other means of keeping a man from going back to England, Poland or any other country.

MR. STANISZEWSKI: Mr. Chairman, do you think that I could have one word here? I am the secretary of the Canadian Polish Congress.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dutkiewicz, are you through?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: I am through if there are no questions to be asked.

The CHAIRMAN: You were here last year?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: As I recall it you were upholding the claim of the Russian Communists at that time.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: That is not true.

The CHAIRMAN: No?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: No. I had some doubts about the political atmosphere in which this problem of immigration was being treated and I asked for a more liberal immigration policy, and I have repeated that request to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: But you and your authorities are sympathetic to the Russian way of life and their interpretation of democratic ideals.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: No, I would not say that. That is a very broad statement, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I know.

Hon Mr. ASELTINE: That is what I gathered last year when you appeared.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you put it in less broad statements?

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: Each one of us has political beliefs. That is, some of us are to the left and some of us are to the right of centre, and I think it would be hard to try and draw a line and say, "There is a man with communistic views."

Mr. STANISZEWSKI: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, I have just one word to say. I am very much surprised at what I have just heard from the last speaker. I have witnessed the way our fellow travellers go around the country making libelous statements with regard to these 4,000 Polish veterans. They lie consistently, and I have just witnessed this to-day. I would just like to have this on record for your committee.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: Mr. Chairman, could I have just one word?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DUTKIEWICZ: I want to state that I am very surprised at this personal unprovoked attack. They can have a different conception of European politics than I have but that is their right, but I did not oppose the entry of Polish soldiers last year, and the records are all here and they may be read. My good friend has a copy of the minutes. I want to say that what he has said is not correct. I expressed some doubt about the matter last year, and the political football made out of this whole question. I could talk a lot about it but I am not going to. I have letters here from the soldiers themselves, but I do not think this is the place for them.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We are much obliged to have both points of views. We have some judgments of our own to utilize occasionally.

Our next witness is Mr. Victor Podoski. Mr. Podoski was formerly representative of Poland here in Canada for a number of years, and he will tell you what his position is at the present time.

Mr. Victor PODOSKI: At the present time I represent the Council for Resettlement of Polish Refugees Limited with headquarters in London, England. It used to be the Committee of Polish Trade and Professional Associations, comprising twenty-two organizations. At the present time three more organizations have been admitted: the Polish Combatants Association Limited, the Polish Air Force Association in Great Britain and the Polish Farmers Association in Great Britain. The name has been changed to that of the Council for Resettlement of Polish Refugees.

Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, Mr. Dubiński has so thoroughly covered the ground that my brief will be brief.



Just a week ago under this very roof, President Truman said amongst other things: "We intend to uphold those who respect the dignity of the individual, who guarantee him equal treatment under law, and who allow him the widest possible liberty to work out his own destiny and achieve success to the limit of his capacity. . . . We count Canada in the forefront of those who share those objectives and ideals."

It is with those words in mind that I have the privilege to appear again before this committee to present the case of Poles who aspire to immigrate to Canada. I shall limit myself exclusively to the Poles outside Poland and only to those amongst them who have already decided not to return, under present conditions, to their native land.

These fall into three main categories. First, the displaced persons: civilian and military. Second, demobilized serviceman. Third, others.

1. The displaced persons. This problem is most urgent. It seems shocking that those men and women two years after the end of the war, still remain in camps where they do not enjoy full liberty and are unable to apply their ability to work out their own destiny.

Recently in an important announcement a member of the Canadian Cabinet heralded the admission of 5,000 displaced persons, the cost of their transportation to be later written off Canada's contribution to this end with the United Nations. May I most earnestly urge this Committee to bring its influence to bear with those who make decisions: firstly, that this number be considered only an initial quota, and secondly, that the Polish nationals in this and future quotas be given a fair and square deal as the nationals of a country which was the first to oppose the Nazi invasion of the world.

In addition to the civilians there are many men and women who belonged to the underground forces, and therefore have lived and fought under particularly hard and dangerous circumstances. It seems now, when the war has been won and the enemy crushed, that those who exposed themselves with such sacrifice, for the common benefit of the world, should not be allowed to rest and rust behind barbed wire. Indeed, it would seem that they should be given preferential treatment as the minimum and belated reward for their share in victory.

These underground fighters, of both sexes, like the civilian displaced persons, represent various trades and professions. A careful selection, from several angles, could result in the re-establishment of these people in their human rights; on the other hand, they could become useful builders, and sometimes pioneers, of Canada's economic and cultural development.

2. Ex-Servicemen: Since we last appeared before your committee on June 25, last year, already over 4,000 Polish veteran farmers have landed in Canada. They were, I believe, the first national group of immigrants admitted here since the war. I understand that some few hundreds more are to be selected by a special Canadian commission now in the United Kingdom. I hope that this will not close the quota in this category.

I have attempted to examine the problem of adaptation of these men to new conditions in a new country, from various angles: their own, that of their employers and that of the officials. It seems that, with inevitable exceptions, after six or eight months of trial and error, it has proved to be a successful experiment. I feel sure that it will register in the annals of Canadian immigration as a noble and notable attempt. The farmers must be satisfied, since more requests for Polish farmhands have come and keep coming from the employers' side. The government must be satisfied since those requests have been granted, and five hundred additional Polish boys are now being selected in England. The veterans, too, are on the whole satisfied. Yet there is ground both for improvement and for expansion, and since it is the Polish side of the picture that I am called upon to present, I would mention a few points:



(1) For humanitarian and social reasons it would be very desirable that the veterans already admitted, as well as those who will follow, should be allowed to bring over members of their families, who are also outside Poland, before the lapse of a two-year period originally set. Perhaps a six-months period, necessary for the establishment on farms, could be taken as the longest waiting time in this connection. It is true that the period of learning the English or French language might thus be somewhat retarded, but the period of assimilation in Canada through family life, which I believe is the basis of sound citizenship, would undoubtedly be shortened. A happy worker is a more efficient worker; he makes a better settler and citizen than a lonely man—irrespective of the language he speaks.

As long as families do not accompany the veterans it would seem essential to let them settle near their relatives or personal friends, if they are fortunate to have such in Canada. And I believe that in all cases facilities to contact Canadians of Polish stock, both in their homes and in organizations, enhances, and does not impede, the process of adaptation of a new man to a new country. The old settler here serves for the new one as a natural link to Canadianship. Any attempt to prevent those contacts would cause bitterness, suspicion and the feeling of coercion, the very things men who come to Canada wish to leave behind them forever. On the other hand, all the endeavours of officials and social workers to bring together the old immigrant and the new one, in the same racial group, inspires confidence, creates contentment and makes the new arrival feel more at home. Keeping in touch with the old immigrants helps to avoid many blunders and disappointments which necessarily accompany the trial and error course of self-experience. I feel that I cannot stress too strongly my conviction, based on long study and observation, that the assimilation to a country and its ideas only through the medium of the language predominant in that country, is a rapid, but superficial assimilation, much as I do not discount the very important language factor.

(2) According to recent regulations, residents of Canada who have relatives overseas are entitled to bring them here if they can provide the necessary housing facilities and upkeep. It seems, therefore, that a number of the Polish veterans now in the United Kingdom who fall into this category could be eligible for admission to this country individually, outside the quota.

(3) It would also be desirable to admit such veterans as now are in the United Kingdom, who have sufficient means to engage in farming on their own. A period of one year's practice and adaptation could perhaps be set, after which these men, with or without families (in the latter case, in groups of two or three) could start their own farms. So far four veterans in this class have received Canadian visas. I understand that there are some 2,000 more who would be eligible.

(4) Further, it would be expedient to admit veterans not only experienced in farming, but in other walks of life as well. In addition to their various occupations before the war, many service men have acquired skill in building roads and bridges, in handling and repairing motorized vehicles; many have learned the craft of a tailor, shoemaker, baker, barber and so on.

(5) The conditions of labour of the newcomers, both on land and in one mill, are the object of constant vigilance, study and attempts for betterment on the part of Parliament and the Department of Labour. The greatest and most universal grievance is the long working hours on farms and in frequent cases no Sunday off for worship and rest. The Department of Labour, at its headquarters and through its inspectors, has always been ready to investigate and improve.

The above concerns the first racial group admitted to Canada since the war, and one with a fine and gallant background. At this juncture I feel that I owe it to them to stand in their defence in view of strange accusations proffered in

several quarters, though probably coming from one source. These accusations are based on the fact that some of these men had worn enemy uniforms before they donned the allied battle dress. It is quite true that some did wear the German uniform.

I suggest that those who, in good faith, repeat these accusations imagine for a while that their own sons had the tragic fate to have to don a uniform of a ruthless oppressor of their race, and to have to expose their lives and health to fight against their own cause. This was the tragic fate of many sons of a country that never failed in loyalty to her allies, and never produced a quisling administration. A large portion of Poland was incorporated by the Germans into the Reich as early as October, 1939, and all the inhabitants of that area, some German settlers, but the majority men of the Polish race, were decreed citizens as the Germans were decreed citizens of the German Reich. Those of military age were conscripted into the Wehrmacht. In other cases, outside the incorporated areas, men were often "invited" to join the German forces. You understand what such invitation meant—an invitation with an "or else" clause. It was similar to "voluntary" surrender of freedom in the round-ups for forced labour or for the concentration camps.

In my brief presented last year I quoted what the Under Secretary of War of the United Kingdom, Mr. Lawson, had to say in this matter. I should like to refer to it on this occasion in an attempt to dispel the persistent misunderstanding.

Let me suggest that the boys who have taken the first opportunity to cross over to the side of the allies, and who later fought against the enemy, deserve special regard and indeed respect. Because if caught by the Germans, and identified as former members of the Reich forces, they would be shot as "traitors" instead of being placed in prison camps. It seems that some unfortunate people are persecuted by fate from every side, that of the enemy, of their allies and even some persons of their own race.

There are no "Nazi sympathizers" among the Polish veterans in Canada. This preposterous accusation was clearly refuted, by Honourable Mr. Humphrey Mitchell speaking in the House of Commons on May 5, 1947, when he had this to say:—

Representations were made by the Polish military authorities pointing out that among those Polish veterans who desired to come to Canada there were a number who had been forcibly conscripted by the Germans and enrolled either in the German armed forces or in the German labour corps and who had deserted at the first opportunity and made their way into allied lines to join the Polish corps. It was represented that men in this category who had risked their lives to desert for the express purpose of joining the Polish corps and had subsequently enrolled in and had actually fought with the Polish corps against the axis powers prior to V-E day would be unfairly discriminated against if they were refused consideration for admission to Canada along with other Polish veterans. These representations were transmitted to the government and it was agreed that Polish veterans in this category would be considered eligible for selection purposes along with other Polish veterans.

All applicants for entry to Canada in this category were nevertheless screened by the security representatives on the mission in the same way as every other applicant.

I wish to put this on the record in justice to the men.

At the end of Mr. Mitchell's remarks he had this further to say:—

However, I must say that consideration is being given to sending two of these Polish veterans back to Great Britain.

This remark caused some of the reporters to surmise that two of these men were Nazi sympathizers. I wrote a letter to the Honourable Humphrey Mitchell and I quote excerpts from his reply under date of May 19th:—

It is true that I did state in the House that we were thinking of sending back two of these Polish veterans, and it may be three. That is because they do not fit in very satisfactorily. . .

When our estimates are being discussed in the House, there may be an opportunity for me to amplify my statement by mentioning that the reason for deporting these Polish veterans was not based on political grounds but rather because of personal unsuitability.

Yours very truly,

“HUMPHREY MITCHELL”

Mr. Victor PODOSKI,  
329 Chapel Street,  
Ottawa.

(3) The last category comprises men and women outside the displaced persons and veterans. They are either individuals or members of professional organizations. They are not numerous. They aspire to a position in Canadian life as individuals, or in small groups ready to establish small factories in which they may apply new inventions.

This Mr. Chairman, is the end of my brief; and I thank you for the privilege of reporting to this committee on Polish facts and views with regard to immigration to Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you, Mr. Podoski. Now we are in rather a hurry, because some of us want to attend a funeral at 2 o'clock of a very distinguished colleague. But there are two other gentlemen who have been promised a hearing today. The one is the Reverend R. Gordon Burgoyne, of the British Dominions Emigration Society of Montreal. He has written asking for an opportunity to make some remarks on behalf of his society. Mr. Burgoyne, we are very sorry to have kept you waiting so long; and please be brief.

Reverend R. GORDON BURGOYNE: Mr. Chairman, my brief is 600 words. Apart from any publication, I really have an apology to make. I had an invitation to come here last August; but because I had been trying for a long time to fight a certain thing which I am mentioning here, which is now being suspended the time being, I could not be here.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Committee:

It is an honour and a privilege to be invited to speak to you as Canadian Manager of the British Dominions Emigration Society. By the way, I had better add a word, as some of you may not know it, to mention that I am a minister of the United Church of Canada, and year by year my presbytery in Montreal very kindly allows me to renew in application, with the consent of the church, to remain one more year in this philanthropic work of trying to make Canada more British in population. I am just saying that by way of a side-line, because you may wonder how I can be a minister and yet be in this work. It is with the sanction of my church; and my work is absolutely un-denominational. We do not draw any denominational line at all. I happen to be a minister of the United Church.

The Society is a philanthropic organization, the oldest of its kind, established in 1882, with headquarters in London, England.



The society has but one aim, to make Canada more British in population, by advising, assisting and arranging for the settlement of those who apply to us to bring their friends and relatives here, and to settle those who have the desire to come without having the advice of the aforesaid friends.

Until the Contract Labour Clause (P.C. 1431) was enforced we used to bring whole families to a given pre-arranged position, but only after being fully satisfied as to the character and capability of the breadwinner of the family. Am very glad that this restriction has been suspended. (P.C. 1329) as it was, in April of this year, for it shows that there is a feeling of optimism in the Department of Mines and Resources as to the ability of Canada to absorb technically trained immigrants who want to be assured of a position before they leave their old positions in the Old Land. This is especially true in the case of men with families.

As you know, when we apply to the Department of Immigration for the entrance of a family where the man is a technician, that fact had to be advertised up and down the papers of Canada before he could come in, up to April of this year.

We have been glad of the opportunity of advising many returned men of the procedure to be followed to bring their brides across, and have brought numbers of fiancées of our returned men to Canada, and are still doing it, and have had the pleasure of greeting many of these young ladies on their arrival here. In all this we have had the full co-operation of the Immigration authorities in Ottawa and elsewhere, and am glad to say I can call them friends as well as officials.

It speaks well for this Society when we have our people whom we were instrumental in bringing to Canada 40 years ago—in fact, I had a letter the other day from a family we brought here 40 years ago, and who are bringing out grandchildren to Canada—continue to keep in touch and send in their applications for friends to come here under our auspices, to say nothing of those who have made Canada their home more recently.

Our Society believes that Canada should have a minimum of 25 million people, and now as always offers its services to bring as many from Britain as possible. So far we have brought around 40,000.

We feel that a greater home market is imperative for Canada—and I was interested in hearing what our Polish friends had to say about that just now—not simply to offset our export market, and so expand the former, but to act as an incentive to keep our Canadian youth in Canada, and to counteract the greater inducements that are offered them in the United States.

I stand before you as one who had several offers, before I graduated in early life in the ministry, to go there, and a number of my classmates from Alberta took those opportunities and are down there yet.

We feel that British people are second to none in their ability to blaze trails and pioneer in new places. When a Britisher makes a mistake in his first efforts, he seldom repeats that mistake.

Those of us who have pioneered know what it is to see a new country in Canada open up, and know the thrill of it, to build where none have built before, to see the first black ribbon of plowing (breaking, as we called it in the West) turn over on the prairie, to the astonishment of the wild life, and to the delight of the gophers and blackbirds. I know, because I too, did it.

I might say that we loan money without interest to British people; in certain cases we give away sums of money; and we are doing a work of which we are very proud.



The original request I hoped to present last year was to ask for your influence in obtaining the removal of the Contract Labour clause. I had a brief prepared at the time, but the opportunity did not present itself. Now, a large part of my thunder has been taken away on account of this suspension, which is a mighty good thing, especially for British people, who were very seriously affected by it before people were allowed to come from the continent of Europe, as they are from the present time.

If anyone would care for copies of the annual report I would be glad to leave some.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Burgoyne, we are very much obliged to you, and are sorry that we could not give you more time.

Mr. BURGOYNE: I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN: I sympathize fully with your statements, because I was born in the Old Land, and came here when I was four.

Mr. BURGOYNE: I came when I was nineteen. That is more years ago than I can remember. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me for appearing to crowd this thing, but we have to hear from Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk, of the British United Press. I think he will take only a few moments.

Mr. R. W. KEYSERLINGK: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators, I do not propose to present a brief, but may I ask your indulgence to draw your attention to one particular group in which I happen to be personally interested, being of that origin myself. It is a group which has not got the good fortune of so many others, of having large elements in this country. I am thinking of the Balts, and particularly of a group of Balts known as the German speaking Balts, who left what was Westphalea, Hanover, and the Low Countries in the thirteenth century, and moved up into the "Baltic provinces", as they were known before the First World War, the Grand Duchy of Courland, Lithuania and Esthonia. They are, I submit, the first victims of Hitler's policy. By a treaty between the German Reich of Hitler and the Latvian government, under pressure of Soviet Russia, and subsequently a special treaty between Hitler and Soviet Russia, these people were bereft, on twenty-four hours' notice, after six hundred years of residence in those parts, of their nationality, of their property, and of their professions, and were sent out by forced echelons to populate what had been subsequently annexed by Germany from western Poland. It was a particularly sad ending to their history, they having been for years in closest and friendliest co-operation with the Balts; and a number of very sad personal tragedies were experienced. I can only mention one that I had very close to my own family: the brother of my own wife, who committed suicide on arrival to "scavenge" upon his former neighbours and friends in Poland. Their sojourn there was forced, and restricted to certain districts only; their properties were never settled; and after a short sojourn there they fled before the approach of the Red Army. About one hundred thousand of them began the flight, and about forty thousand are still left to-day, more or less in the western zones of Germany.

These people do not come under the ordinary category of displaced persons, since their migration and their forced evacuation occurred before the war, and since they before the war, under a so-called orderly process of an agreement between Germany and Soviet Russia, lost their nationality and consequently were no longer nationals of Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania, of which they had been nationals before. This made their juridical position extremely difficult, and they are now pleading, through the associations which they tried to form, before the international refugee organization, in conjunction with other groups of a similar nature, to have the status of political refugees which is really theirs. There is no doubt about it that they are political refugees, since the only reason they left

the country was that they were not willing and able to live under the regime which now exists in their native countries of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, as part of the Soviet Union.

I would like to point out that the only organization which they founded was an organization of their church. I think that about 98 per cent were Lutherans; a certain percentage of them were Roman Catholics; and it is only through the church organizations that they were able to provide for themselves some sort of self help and assistance. Through the great assistance and kindness of certain friends in Canada, the Baltic Refugees and Central Europe Relief Committee was formed, and the slight aid we were able to give them in the form of food, parcels and clothing has been on a very small scale. The whole problem will not be solved until a new home is found for them. I would just like to take the liberty of drawing to the attention of honourable senators the existence of groups of this kind, whose tradition, whose political record and whose resourcefulness through the centuries in which they have lived in those countries would make them, I think, well worth the attention which any Canadian immigration policy might want to devote to them as possible settlers, without urging at the present time any policy or any special method of doing it, since that is a matter in the judgment of the Canadian government.

I should like to add one last word. It has been a fact that they are a very strongly unified denominational group. The assistance in the work of charity has also been given by our Catholic fellow citizens, and it has shown that the approach to the whole problem has been one of pure christian charity towards men who had the convictions and the attitude towards individuals, exactly opposite to what our country has not only preached but practised. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ballantyne, the vice-chairman of our committee is here with me, and I would appreciate it if he might be given one moment in which to explain the general attitude taken in this.

Mr. M. G. BALLANTYNE (Editor, Canadian Register; Vice-Chairman of Baltic Relief): Mr. Chairman and honourable senators of the Senate committee, I would be very glad if I might have a moment to corroborate what the chairman of the Baltic Relief has told you. I speak not only as chairman of the Baltic Relief Committee but also as editor of a recognized Catholic publication and also as one who has been studying this particular problem.

One of the things that has inhibited us in the past in immigration has been fear of political trouble arising out of our creedal and racial difficulties in Canada. I simply wish to testify that these difficulties will not be present, in my opinion, on the reception of people such as the Balts. The ecclesiastical authorities in Canada, and particularly those in Quebec, are doubly aware of the fact that we have a small obligation and christian duty to receive the displaced persons and other war refugees. This has been attested to by a publication issued by the hierarchy of Quebec in which it is stated that they do not restrict their desire to accepting those of their own faith. They hold that Canada should be open to refugees of good will and who can be assimilated into the Canadian way of life. I may say therefore on behalf of the Catholic authorities of Quebec that they would welcome any movement on behalf of the government to extend christian charity to these people.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to say to you gentlemen that I will personally see that when the committee is drafting their report they will take into account these questions and will make what recommendations appear to be proper.

Honourable senators, at the last meeting of the committee Senator Hushion made a reference to the transportation of immigrants. I at once sent a copy of his representation to Mr. Howe and also to Mr. Keenleyside, the Deputy Minister. The return letter from Mr. Keenleyside reads in part as follows:

"We are following this matter with great care and I have hopes that a material improvement in the situation may be reported shortly. I shall discuss with the Right Honourable C. D. Howe the suggestion made by Senator Hushion. Thank you very much for bringing this matter to my attention."

The meeting slated for tomorrow has been cancelled, and there has been placed on the order paper a request for a meeting a week from today at which time I hope that a majority of the committee will be able to get together to draw up a report that will be submitted to the Senate before the close of the session. I regret that we have been short of time and have had to rush matters this morning.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: When I was out this morning I called Miss Maines, the executive secretary of social workers. She had mentioned that one of their Canadian social workers had been with UNRRA and that she would like to appear before the Senate committee. It has been impossible for this woman to appear as I understand she is in Mexico, but Miss Maines has a brief which she would like to present herself. I wonder if this brief could possibly be placed on our records.

The CHAIRMAN: Has Miss Maines got it right now?

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Miss Maines can present the brief at any time, but we had hoped for the social worker to have appeared herself.

The CHAIRMAN: May I suggest that Miss Maines come to us a week from today at 10.30 and we will try to hear her.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I should like that very much.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry to have appeared to rush matters this morning, but it has been because of the volume of work we had ahead of us. We will now adjourn until next Wednesday at 10.30 a.m.







or Doc  
Can  
Com  
I

Canada Immigration and  
Standing Committee 1947

(1947)

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



## PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

## STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

# Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 13

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

---

### WITNESSES:

Miss Joy A. Maines, Ottawa, Ontario, Executive Secretary, The Canadian Association of Social Workers.

Dr. Mladen Giunio-Zorkin, Windsor, Ontario, Secretary of the Supreme Committee, Croatian Peasant Society.

OTTAWA  
EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
1947

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

### The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

---

### ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 25th June, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators Murdock, Chairman; Buchanan, Campbell, Euler, Hushion, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Molloy, Roebuck, Taylor, Veniot and Wilson.—12.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

The official reporters of the Senate were in attendance.

Miss Joy A. Maines, Ottawa, Ontario, Executive Secretary, The Canadian Association of Social Workers, appeared and read a brief recommending immigration to Canada of displaced persons of Europe, submitted on behalf of The Canadian Association of Social Workers, and was questioned.

Dr. Mladen Giunio-Zorkin, Windsor, Ontario, Secretary of the Supreme Committee, Croatian Peasant Society, appeared and read a brief on Immigration to Canada of displaced persons of Europe of Croatian origin, submitted on behalf of the Canadian Croatian Peasant Society, and was questioned.

At 11.50 o'clock, a.m., the Committee adjourned until Wednesday next, 2nd July, 1947, at 10.30 a.m.

ATTEST:

H. ARMSTRONG,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THE SENATE,

WEDNESDAY, June 25, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour, which was authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act, met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, it is now 10.30. Shall we proceed? The first witness this morning will be Miss Joy A. Maines, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Association of Social Workers.

Miss Joy A. MAINES: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before presenting my statement I should like to explain to you that the Canadian Association of Social Workers is the body which represented the professional social workers in Canada, and I am making this statement on their behalf.

The Canadian Association of Social Workers believes it is in a better position than many organizations to make recommendations in regard to the entry of Displaced Persons into Canada, as it has had some twenty members serving with UNRRA in Europe for the past two years. Several of these members have held positions as Welfare Officers in Assembly Centres for Displaced Persons in Germany, one has had experience in an Emigration Centre in the U.S. zone of Germany, and all have had extensive dealings with Baltic, Ukrainian, Polish and Jewish groups. It is on the basis of their experience, obtained from them by correspondence, that this statement is presented.

1. Displaced Persons would be very desirable Canadian citizens because:

- (a) They have lived through so many hardships that they are not afraid to tackle difficult situations.
- (b) They cannot return to their own homelands for political and religious reasons, and are anxious to establish their families in a new land where they may find employment and security.
- (c) They are not the dregs of humanity but in the main are people of intelligence and vast courage. The level of intelligence is high, because *intelligence* has been the means of survival. The mentally retarded were weeded out by the Nazis and the physically handicapped succumbed to the hazards of existence under war conditions.
- (d) Their health has been carefully guarded in Assembly Centres, and for this reason is probably better than that of other prospective immigrants. The children have benefited by special feeding, medical and recreation programmes.
- (e) They have learned the meaning of International understanding and good will during their stay in Assembly Centres, through their contact with UNRRA staff who are from many different countries, and through co-operating with many nationalities in the Centres where they have been located.
- (f) They have initiative and are enterprising. They have shown an amazing capacity to set up practical forms of self-government and to retain their religious practices; to keep their cultural life at a high level, and to organize recreation for all age groups. Most Assembly Centres

have managed to maintain at least a semblance of a comparatively high standard of living despite over-crowding and a serious lack of essential supplies. The Displaced Persons have zealously guarded all they could of their forms of art—painting, music, poetry, folk dancing, needlework and wood-carving. Some groups have learned to build log cabins in preparation for a pioneer life, which, Mr. Chairman, might help to solve our housing problem.

- (g) Their desire for education is marked. Their school teachers have made heroic efforts to conduct classes that ranged from kindergarten to adult education, in spite of lack of school books and supplies. Some students have continued university courses.

2. The Canadian Association of Social Workers is convinced that transferring immigrants in *family groups* and settling a small number of families in different districts is wise, because

- (a) Displaced Persons are terrified of being parted again from their families, and are eager to have homes of their own. They have a great love for their children and zealously guard family life. These characteristics should be fostered. The children are happy and have learned to be self-reliant and to enjoy simple pleasures.
- (b) Colonies of immigrants tend to create "little Europes" in Canada. This Association therefore recommends that means be devised to break down mass groups into smaller ones so that they may be assimilated more easily in any community. This would also aid in a speedier transference of their affection and allegiance to this country.
- (c) In accepting family groups, Canada should be willing to take a share of the less able and older persons. If these people are left behind they would become the most sadly neglected people in the world. The individual family concerned should of course be prepared to take responsibility for the normal care of such persons.

3. Definite information in regard to the skills of Displaced Persons has already been presented to the Senate Committee. A list of some of the professions and occupations represented in Assembly Centres gives some idea of the assets by which Canada might profit if consideration were given to the admission of other than labourers, miners, farmers, domestic servants and factory workers:

accountants	doctors	professors
engineers	lawyers	judges
artists	teachers	clergymen
musicians	nurses	agriculturalists

Among the skilled tradesmen can be found: shoemakers, carpenters, cabinet makers, tailors, watchmakers, silversmiths, masons, toymakers and electricians.

4. As undesirables can be found in any large group of people, it is recommended that careful screening be undertaken so that political fanatics, collaborators, criminals and other undesirable characters may not be admitted. It is the opinion of our members that carefully selected teams should visit Assembly Centres for the purpose of selecting family groups of all nationalities. These teams should include medical, psychiatric and welfare personnel, as well as labour and immigration experts, and should work in close co-operation with the military government, UNRRA and camp leaders in this task. UNRRA has compiled registration, medical and employment records which should prove invaluable. The Canadian social workers presently in Germany with UNRRA be used in this selection process, because of their close association with Displaced Persons, and their knowledge of Canada and conditions of life here.

5. The desirability of Displaced Persons as Canadian settlers is shown by the characteristics of nationalities with whom our members have had contact.

*Baltics* (Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians)—are socially and culturally on a par with Canada. They have an appreciation of art and a deep religious sense, which is not fanatical. They are skilled and self sufficient and have shown tremendous initiative and organizing ability. They built trade schools, handicraft shops, furniture and manufacturing plants out of debris and junk. They created schools and universities without necessary supplies. Their basic industries are similar to those of Canada. They are clean, with high living standards.

*Ukrainians*: Of the Ukrainians left in Displaced Persons Assembly Centres a small percentage are intelligentsia following professions, and a large number are tradesmen and labourers. They are hard working, ambitious, adaptable and co-operative. Many of them have distant relatives or friends in this country. The young people are keen students.

*Poles*—Although the majority of the Poles are farmers, miners, and unskilled labourers, they show a keen business sense. They have an appreciation of art and are deeply religious. The young people are eager to learn. The climate of Poland and Canada is much alike.

*Jews*: The Jewish people show aptitudes for business and some of them for farming. Some of the younger people want to come to the western world, whereas some show fanatical zeal to establish themselves in Palestine. Our Association feels that the Jewish people should not be considered as a "group apart" but as nationals of their country of origin, to which they cannot return because of persecution which would ensue. Those who are eager to come to Canada look upon our country as one supporting democratic principles, fair play and religious tolerance.

### *Summary*

The Canadian Association of Social Workers therefore urges

1. That serious consideration be given to the settlement in Canada of Displaced Persons now in Assembly Centres in Europe, and that admission be extended to professional and skilled occupational groups.

2. That a policy of non-discrimination on racial and religious grounds be adopted.

3. That the policy of transferring family groups together be adopted, and that settlement plans be other than on a colony basis.

4. That careful screening methods be devised, and that selection teams include medical, psychiatric and welfare personnel as well as labour and immigration experts.

5. That after admission to Canada every effort be made to assist the new citizens to become assimilated quickly, and to make a success of life in Canada.

6. That any plan of juvenile immigration (children without parents) be subject to approval by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare, as well as provincial departments of child welfare, in order to ensure that juvenile immigrants will be protected to the same degree as Canadian children.

That concludes my brief, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): What is the proportion of men to women?

Miss MAINES: In our Association?



Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): No, among the people you want to bring over.

Miss MAINES: I cannot give you those figures.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Nor their ages?

Miss MAINES: Well, they are all ages.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Would you mind telling us how many speak English and French?

Miss MAINES: The reports from our workers who are over there say there are quite a number of people in the displaced persons camps learning to speak English, and the Polish and Ukrainian and Baltic groups have been learning English in their assembly centres.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Their schools. Do you mind my asking a few questions?

Miss MAINES: Not at all. I shall be glad.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You spoke about screening out the criminals and collaborators and Nazis and that sort of thing. Are there such? We have been told that the D.P. camps have already done that, that a person is not a "displaced person" if he is an enemy alien or has taken part in the war against the Allies.

Miss MAINES: Well, in one of the communications which I received from one of our members who has been working in an immigration centre in the United States zone, it appears that they are again screening the group prior to their coming to the United States or to South America.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You have to weed out any that did get in?

Miss MAINES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: You spoke about a policy of non-discrimination on the ground of race or religion being adopted. Well, is not that our policy now?

Miss MAINES: I would hope so.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There should not be any mistake about that? It would not be "adopting", it would be continuing, would it not?

Miss MAINES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And if we continue discrimination of the kind you have in mind, would it be possible to discriminate in favour of the groups that you have mentioned? You have mentioned the Baltic group, the Poles, Ukrainians and the Jews. That pretty well is the whole group, is it not?

Miss MAINES: It certainly is the whole group with which our members have had contact; and these remarks are based on the information from them.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is not much left after you take the Baltic people, Poles, Ukrainians and the Jews. There would be some few Germans, I suppose—Germans who have been driven out by the Nazi regime?

Miss MAINES: I have no information about that group.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Any report on the communist activities in these groups, at all?

Miss MAINES: No.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): You do not know what their political ideas are at any time?

Miss MAINES: No.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): Well, that is the most important thing in it, I think. We do not want a lot of riff-raff from there coming over here and starting communism in this country. It is bad enough as it is. And you have no check on that at all?

Miss MAINES: The screening devices that would be used should take care of any situations like that.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD (*Shediac*): "Should take care". But do they ?

The CHAIRMAN: We have got to draw our conclusions on that question from other sources of information.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: You spoke of moving families as a whole.

Miss MAINES: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: With which I agree. Then you made some reference to the older people. I do not know what age you have in mind, but I would say, people around from sixty years up. You would expect us to handle them with the families?

Miss MAINES: Well, you must realize, of course, that our Association is primarily interested in welfare aspects of a situation; and there might be, say, a grandmother who would be left alone in Germany if she could not come with the rest of the family to Canada.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Well, what do you suggest would be the proper course in a case of that kind?

Miss MAINES: Our suggestion would be that she should be permitted to come with the rest of the family group, and that the family group would take responsibility for her care in Canada, so that she would not become a public charge.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: The trouble is that the family group might not be able to do that. Financially they might not be in that position.

Miss MAINES: Well, we would hope that the employment which would be secured for them in Canada would be such that they would be able to provide for themselves and their dependents.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I was wondering whether anybody knows the answer to this question, which is involved in what we call this screening process.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Mr. Euler, before we leave this last subject, may I just make this point?

Hon. Mr. EULER: You interrupt me. I did not interrupt you.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I have a sort of an idea, a suspicion, that the screening consists pretty largely of deciding whether they are physically and mentally competent; or does it apply to races as well, or ideologies?

Miss MAINES: Well, our Association would feel that they should be physically and mentally fit, plus socially fit.

Hon. Mr. EULER: What do you mean by "socially fit"?

Miss MAINES: Well, they would be people who would be adaptable to a new country and would have shown the ability to get along with others, and would be co-operative.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Pretty difficult, is it not?

Miss MAINES: Well, that is why we are suggesting that these social workers of ours who have been living in assembly centres with these people for two years, know them pretty well, could serve in an advisory capacity perhaps to the experts who go over to select these people. I believe that in some areas, in regard to a screening process in the United States zone, they have been using the counter intelligence service of the United States army in their screening process.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I was just wondering what things they took into consideration in their screening. Health, of course; that is the chief one.

Miss MAINES: Both physical and mental health are very important; and certainly the group representing the employer group want to be sure that people have capabilities for the type of employment that is available in Canada.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I want to make this point before you leave that subject, the subject of family discrimination. It has been the policy of our department for many years not to separate families. If you cannot bring the whole family we won't bring anybody. That has been our policy, to my knowledge, for a very long time; and of course, I, speaking for myself, thoroughly approve of what you say. To leave one member of a family behind is not fair dealing at all; it is a cruel thing to do.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: I think we all agree on that.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: That is where the difference of opinion is. It is a conflict at the moment between the Department of Labour and the Immigration Department, as you know. The Labour Department has stressed the value of bringing men without their families; and I know that that is not the idea of the immigration branch, particularly the Director. They have always stressed bringing family groups.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a question that we should stress in our report, as to our view of that particular subject.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I feel very strongly on that question. I do not know, Miss Maines, whether you should mention the difficulties that occurred before on that account. Do you think it would be well to mention it?

Miss MAINES: Yes. There is the experience years ago of people being brought out for a specific type of work in Canada, while their families were left behind. The men had employment probably for six months or a year. They hoped to be able to send money back to bring out their families, and they never were able to get them into that position, so you had the men living as single men in Canada, or as transients—a great many of them—and the families of the men remaining in Europe.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: There are a number of men, especially central Europeans, in the mining camps, who leave their families overseas and hope to bring them over later.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That has been accentuated by the breaking out of the war.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It happened long before the war. The 1930 depression struck them, and these men are still absent from their families.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions to Miss Maines?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: It was a splendid talk, Miss Maines.

Miss MAINES: I hoped to have a colleague here who was with me in Germany, but unfortunately she could not be here this morning.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: I think it was clearly evident in the case of the evacuee children: where the placements were done by social workers, the results were satisfactory; there were maybe only fifteen or twenty cases of misfits. Any difficulties we had were in connection with those who came out privately.

Miss MAINES: Yes, we had to "pick up the pieces."

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now hear from Dr. Mladen Giunio-Zorkin, who represents the Canadian Croatian Peasant Society. It so happens that the morning edition of the *Ottawa Journal* has on its editorial page an article on a subject practically the same as this gentleman is going to present to us.

Dr. MLADEN GIUNIO-ZORKIN, Secretary of the Supreme Committee, Croatian Peasant Society: Mr. Chairman and honourable senators of this committee, I am here on behalf of the Canadian Croatian Peasant Society to present to you a short brief presenting the view of Canadians of Croatian origin.

Hon. Mr. EULER: There are two races in Yugoslavia, are there not? The Croatsians . . . . .

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: And the other are the Serbs.



Hon. Mr. EULER: You are just representing the Croatians?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes. This is my brief:

The solution of the immigration problem with which your Committee is dealing, involves also many from Yugoslavia such as Croatians, Serbs and Slovenes who are now displaced persons in Europe and who are suitable for immigration to Canada. You have heard from many organizations and notable authorities appearing before you, splendid reports on this subject. Specially we would underline the arguments presented by Canadian Polish Congress on June 18, 1947, which describe profoundly the situation of a similar Slav peasant country. We would like to add a few remarks regarding the Croatians from Yugoslavia. Before we present our views, it would be necessary to say a few words about Croatians who became "new Canadians". Looking at them you can form an opinion as to whether the new immigration plan will consider Croatians as constructive immigrants to Canada.

1. The immigration to Canada from Yugoslavia (composed mostly of Croatians) began after the first world war. Coming from a country where 90% of the population are peasant farmers they came here to find a free new life with the same wish to work on the land. Unfortunately they could not remain on farms as agricultural workers, because they were used for centuries to living as peasants—which means owners of their land. Therefore, among approximately thirty thousand Yugoslavs (mostly Croats and Serbs from Croatia) the majority started to work in mines, forests and factories, being the solution for a better living.

We cannot state, as the other representatives of the different groups state in their statement to this honourable Committee, that the Croatians played any part in the political and cultural development of Canada, but the majority of our immigrants, probably 90% remained until to-day as ordinary miners (Schumacher, Kirkland Lake, Val d'Or, Bourlameque, etc.) as factory workers (Windsor, Welland, Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, etc.) as lumbermen (Port Arthur, and British Columbia) as farmers (Saskatchewan)—playing their part in the economic development of a growing nation. Many of them, in the last ten years have saved sums of money, bought farms and returned to their peasant life. In the meantime, Croatian immigration in the United States (about 1,500,000) started sixty years ago and the second and third generation immigrants took an important part in the progress of their new homeland, eg., Mr. Nikola Tesla, an electrician and inventor who worked with Edison and designed the great power system at Niagara—he was a Serb from Croatia; Mr. Michael Pupin, American physician and inventor, who was educated at Columbia University and became Professor of Economics in 1901; Henry Suzalo, American educator, who became President of the University of Washington, and from 1930 until his death he was President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

2. According to the Inter-governmental Committee on Refugees 75,000 Yugoslavs are displaced persons in Europe, but we are informed that the correct number is double that. The reason for not registering themselves as displaced persons was the fear that they would be recalled to Yugoslavia. The repatriation to Yugoslavia by the Allied Military Command of over 50,000 Croatian soldiers and civilian refugees in Austria in 1945 resulted in massacres of Bleiburg, Maribor and Samobor. These displaced persons originated for the following reasons:

- (a) Hitler's war machine, hungry for manpower, during four years of war took from Croatia 60,000 peasants and sent them to factory work as slave labourers where they worked together with even larger numbers of Serbian prisoners-of-war.



- (b) The Italian occupation of a part of Yugoslavia sent to concentration camps 75,000 Croats according to the Italian official statement of August, 1943.
- (c) The Communist control of Yugoslavia obliged many thousand Yugoslavs to escape from the hell of communistic terror.

Seventy per cent of these displaced persons are peasants and workers, the reason being that they come from a ninety per cent peasant nation.

3. On the occasion of the recent departure of Yugoslav Canadians for Yugoslavia on June 8th, the organized members of 25 branches of the Croatian Peasant Society made the following statement:

We condemn the subversive work of the so-called "Council of Canadian South Slavs" which has ruthlessly exploited our compatriots in Canada in the interests of international communism.

Under the title, "The Council of Canadian South Slavs", and through their official organs "Novosti", "Srpski", "Glasnik" and "Edinost", communist newspapers edited in Toronto, communist agents have sought to create feelings of discontent, illwill and unrest amongst our countrymen in Canada. Yugoslav Canadians, some duped by communist propaganda, and others, in their ignorance, fearing reprisals on their relatives in the old country, are required to contribute huge funds, which are pooled in the "Council of Canadian South Slavs", ostensibly to help war-devastated Yugoslavia, *but actually to bolster Tito's dictatorial regime.*

We appeal to the Canadian people to help us in this struggle and to lay bare the subversive activities of communist inspired organizations in our Dominion.

As loyal citizens of this, our new homeland, Canada, thankful to her for her hospitality and the privileges we now enjoy of justice and liberty which we have never known in our native land, we consider it our solemn duty to guard our precious Canadian heritage and to protect the democratic principles of our people everywhere.

4. Our Societies are willing to take responsibility, materially and morally, for the care of these new Croatian immigrants, to teach them (through children born in Canada) the English or French language and to educate them in the principles of democracy and freedom which is part of our Canadian way of living. Our halls which we possess in all the biggest cities (on July 5th we open a new community hall in Windsor) will be open to new immigrants for special courses held by our youngsters who know both languages.

In our opinion one of Canada's biggest problems is to take special care that new immigrants in Canada will not be left by themselves, that is to say, unadvised, undirected and suitable bait for communists. What better way is there to avoid such a situation than to express in the "old country tongue" our belief in the Canadian way of life, and our gratitude to and love for our new homeland, Canada.

#### *Conclusion:*

We recommend to this Committee that permission be granted to ten thousand displaced persons from Yugoslavia (Croats, Serbs and Slovenes) to immigrate to Canada.

We propose that you recommend to close collaboration between Government authorities (Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, the Canadian Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State, etc.) and Canadian societies which represent the various ethnic groups, regarding information and recommendations concerning prospective immigrants.

The Croatian Peasant Society is willing to accept the responsibility for new immigrants allowed to come to Canada either as relatives or prospective workers, who will be allotted to various branches of our Society.

On behalf of the twenty-five Branches of the Croatian Peasant Society in Canada, which I represent here this morning, I wish to thank the Senate Committee for the opportunity of this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I am wondering whether the propaganda from the communist group is sufficient to explain the considerable number of Yugoslavs who have left Canada recently? It seems to me it would take an awful lot of talking about governmental ideology to induce one to leave a country where one is not being interfered with by governmental forces and go to another country where it is said to be ever so free and attractive. It would take a great deal of talk to induce one to make a move of that kind.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: You must take into consideration the fact that the majority of Yugoslavs here came to this country as illiterate people and have made a living by working very hard in mines and factories and have not had the opportunity to learn enough of the English language. Therefore all the news that they have received from the world has been through newspapers printed in their own language. As I have mentioned, the communists have three newspapers in Toronto with a staff of forty people and from day to day they print articles to explain the world and Canadian situations to those workers. They paint an attractive picture of the so-called paradise in Yugoslavia and they make the people believe that there is probably something true in what they say. All these people have families in Yugoslavia and that means that they are in constant fear of the communists, in expressing any opposite opinion, because of the fact that their families will be persecuted. In the last year the communists have tried to explain that a terrific depression is coming to Canada and that the best way to save their money is for them to go now to Yugoslavia. They publish articles about that in every newspaper.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are these papers published in the Croatian language in Canada?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes, in Toronto.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Junio-Zorkin, I wonder if I might read a few paragraphs from the editorial appearing in the *Journal* on this subject and then ask you to explain them? The article starts "How come 500 Yugoslav-Canadians have packed up and left what we like to think is the world's most fortunate country and headed for the war-torn and war-threatened continent? And how come another 1,500 will probably follow suit within the year, taking with them their goods and chattels and all the money they can muster?" A little further down the article continues, "Departure of these 2,000 Yugoslavs has been organized by the Yugoslav Charge d'Affaires, who resides in Ottawa, although he will say that he has been only the enabling intermediary. He told the Canadian government these people 'were planning to return to Yugoslavia for the purpose of lending their skill and assistance in the reconstruction of the country'". Perhaps you can tell us what there is to that.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The movement of the Canadian Slavs was definitely inspired by official Yugoslav diplomatic sources. We can even give some proof of that.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Here in Ottawa?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that communistically inclined?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The Yugoslav representatives are the representatives of the communist regime. Therefore they are communistically inclined. For instance, the first secretary of Council of Canadian South Slavs, Mr. Steve

Miosic, is a Canadian citizen. He worked on that council which was making arrangements for transportation and which was taking the money from these immigrants for three years. Finally this year he was appointed the press attache in the Yugoslavia legation in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Although he is Canadian citizen?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes. He is a Canadian citizen and he is the press attache, and was appointed on March 1, 1947. Until that date he was secretary of the Canadian Council of South Slavs, which organization arranged all that exodus of Yugoslavs. In the legation here in Ottawa other Canadian citizens are being employed in such capacities as assistant press attache and so on. The secretary of this committee, Mr. Edo Yardas, was a veteran of the Spanish war in which campaign he lost his leg. Six months ago he visited Yugoslavia and was highly decorated by Tito for his work, and he came back to Canada and arranged this exodus from Montreal. After the departure of the Yugoslavs from Montreal on the 7th and 8th of June, the Council of Canadian South Slavs published a resolution in which they stated that that was only the beginning of the work. They published in the Croatian language that the processes will take many years until all patriotic Slavs will go back.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are they financing themselves or are they being financed by Tito's government?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: They are in possession of \$1,500,000 collected by these Yugoslavs who left for Yugoslavia; in the meantime they are collecting large sums of money for help of reconstruction of Yugoslavia. I doubt if some of that money except in machinery will go to Yugoslavia.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are any funds supplied by the Yugoslav government for this work in Canada and for the repatriating of Yugoslavs to their country?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I cannot say that, except that the most active members, who are Canadian citizens, are on the payroll of the Yugoslavia Legation here.

Hon. Mr. EULER: One would think the money would ordinarily come from the home country.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: The ship sent to bring these people from Canada to Yugoslavia was provided by the government of Yugoslavia?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes, that is so. That was a transport troop ship, especially adapted for carrying out large numbers of people.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: But the ship, as far as I know, was paid for by the government of Yugoslavia?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes, by the government of Yugoslavia.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: You spoke of newspapers which have been carrying on communistic agitation among these people. Are there newspapers that have been attempting to counteract that agitation? I mean newspapers under the auspices of your organization.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: We have one weekly newspaper in Winnipeg, the Croatian Voice. It is only a weekly, and is edited by one man. We try to counteract the agitation but with only one issue a week against newspapers every second day from Toronto, it is rather difficult.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are these people learning the English language, or is the only way of reaching them through a paper published in their own language?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The young speak English very well but not the older people.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is that what you meant by your second paragraph on page 4 of your brief, which reads:



In our opinion one of Canada's biggest problems is to take special care that new immigrants in Canada will not be left by themselves, that is to say, unadvised, undirected and suitable bait for communists. What better way is there to avoid such a situation than to express in the "old country tongue" our belief in the Canadian way of life, and our gratitude to and love for our new homeland, Canada.

Do you mean by that paragraph that increased information should be spread among the older people? The younger, as you say, can read the Canadian newspapers.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Do you think that their language should be perpetuated so that more news will reach them in that language?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: For approximately a year the new immigrants will not be able to read English.

Hon. Mr. EULER: How would you correct that difficulty.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: In all the larger cities of Canada we have our colonies and branches. If the new immigrant is directed to places where the older Croatians are living together, they will have an opportunity to hear what is going on from day to day explained in their own language.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Who would do that?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The Croatians who are new Canadians.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are you suggesting that the government of Canada, for example, should assist in that matter.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I think it should in some way. Our opinion would be that collaboration is necessary between the various ethnic groups on the scale of fair play, that all news will be printed in the papers of the groups who are new Canadians. We have many examples of most important news to Canada not being printed in communistic papers. I cannot say what should be done, but something should be done.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Your thought is that the people who do not read anything but their own language should be placed in a position to receive news about Canada and our way of life?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Which they are not receiving now?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: No.

Hon. Mr. EULER: And they are being subjected to communistic propaganda?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: That is the idea. How would it be best to accomplish that end? I have spoken to some people in the Citizenship Branch, and I gave my opinion that for the new Canadians a publication should be printed weekly or monthly in their language, as educational material, until they are able to read English. In any event, care must be taken to see to it that the proper news reaches these people, instead of leaving them to read very intelligently written communistic propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN: Where do you live, Dr. Giunio-Zorkin?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: In Windsor.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you a practising physician, or what occupation do you follow?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I am a lawyer. I was a barrister in Yugoslavia and I am a Doctor of the Roman and Canon Law.

The CHAIRMAN: How long have you been in Canada?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Just a year.

The CHAIRMAN: Where did you come from?



Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yugoslavia. In 1914 I left Yugoslavia as a wounded soldier. I was a year in Italy, and I was appointed to the War Crimes Commission. I left in 1945 because of political disagreement with Tito.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Did you speak the English language before you left Yugoslavia?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: No, unfortunately not.

Hon. Mr. EULER: You have done very well.

The CHAIRMAN: You were a soldier in the war?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: On which side?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I was on the allied side; I led an underground Croatian movement. I was invited for a lecture tour on behalf of the Croatian peasant society.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you getting well established in Windsor?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I actually spend little time in Windsor, because I am lecturing all over Canada and the United States.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Is my impression correct that the Croatians after the invasion by the Germans were collaborating quite extensively with them?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I should not say so. A small group of Croatian national fanatics who for fifteen or twenty years caused Yugoslavia to fight against the dictatorship of King Alexander came back with the help of the Germans and took power, especially under Pavelic who was a new leader, but the majority of the nation opposed them with all their strength. We fought in such a way as to lose 2,000,000 people in four years of war. I know because I was in the fight with no means of combatting the German and Italian people.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: But, is there a movement in the United States back to Yugoslavia similar to what has taken place in Canada?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The movement started at the same time in the United States, but the State Department in a note on April 16 said that that department would allow no Yugoslav American to go back to Yugoslavia; in other words, it refused to give them visas or permission to leave.

The CHAIRMAN: If that had been done here, we would not have had this large exodus?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Definitely. The ship, the Rodnik, which took the Yugoslavs back to their country, was going to New York to collect Americans. The Rodnik went to New York, but took none, but the Americans came across the border and took the ship in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. EULER: If these people are communists would it not be better to let them go to Yugoslavia rather than keep them here as distributors of communistic propaganda?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: It is my own opinion that they are not communists.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Why do you say that?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: The communists stay here; they are needed here.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Why would they go to a country in which they know they are up against a communistic government?

The CHAIRMAN: They were misinformed and really believed that it was desirable that they go back to their native land in order to bring about better conditions.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: That is exactly the situation. The communists needed their return for many reasons. One of which was to show to the people of eastern Europe that economic conditions in the western democracies, especially United States and Canada, are so bad that the workers for the first time in

history are leaving this continent to return to Europe. They need that for propaganda purposes in Yugoslavia.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I do not see why if these people could be persuaded to go back to a communistic country when they themselves are not communists.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Probably I can explain that feature. The communists needed these people and they tried their best to oblige them. Further, they needed the youngsters for educational purposes, who some day will be sent back; they are born Canadians and no one can say they cannot come here. They will be useful workers. Our people here were under the impression that communism is definitely a power that tomorrow or at some future date, will overrun the world; that the communistic movement is led by Slavs. Therefore, their duty is to help that cause, and they thought that if they went now they would be in a favoured position. That is what was in the minds of these people—I spoke to many of them. I would say that 90 per cent of the people who left from Montreal are not really communists. The communists, as I say, are needed here. Most of them are older people—65 or 70 years of age, who are tired and who have families of their own. It is well known that no relatives of Canadians citizens up to now have been allowed to leave Yugoslavia to come to Canada. During the war many of the families were killed or destroyed. These older people think that if their relatives cannot come here they will go and see them; they wish to see their sons and daughters, and the only way it can be accomplished is to return to their native land.

Hon. Mr. EULER: They are convinced that communism is the coming thing and that they had better get a line on it now?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Doctor, you were talking about 70,000 Yugoslavs that are in Germany and Italy; and I think that you are recommending that we should receive some of these people in Canada. You say that most of them who came originally were of peasant stock. By that you mean that they were on farms?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: But when they came over here, very few of them went on farms.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: They went into mines and industry.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Have you any figures as to the number that are actually on farms throughout Canada?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: I cannot say exactly, but probably during the war, in the last years, when they were able to make some money, probably twenty-five or thirty per cent became farmers. I know of many of them in Windsor and Hamilton. When they reach the sum of \$15,000, immediately they go and buy a farm because they feel that that is the life they like.

The CHARMAN: You will find a great many of them up around the Leamington district. Quite a few up there own their own farms, and they have been working there right along for the last few years.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: The reason they do not take up farms when they come out here first is that they like to go and buy a farm?

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Why do they not go and work on the farms rather than in the mines and factories, since they were brought up as farmers in their own country?

Hon. Mr. EULER: They could not make enough money there.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There is more money in mining.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: That is one reason. But, second, there is a complex connected with the peasant life in our country. Our peasants for centuries were owners of the land, and they feel that everybody who is without land is somebody who is inferior. They do not want now, coming here to find a better life, to choose a profession that in their eyes will be inferior to that which they had over there. We have examples of our people coming to Belgium and France, and when they have got enough money to buy a farm and they went into agriculture. They went first to the factories, and when they had enough money they started as owners of the land.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Doctor, we are very much obliged to you for the information you have given us, and we will take it fully into consideration in making our report.

Dr. GIUNIO-ZORKIN: Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN: I think, gentlemen, that this is the last witness we are to have before this committee. The next thing to be considered is the preparation of a report to the Senate on what has developed. Our friend Senator Roebuck has been very busy, and is not able to get into this matter yet. I have before me all the printed records of previous meetings, and I thought it might be helpful if I were to go over some of these to show who appeared before us, so that Senator Roebuck would get our point of view as to whether we should touch upon the statements made by certain individuals. The first meeting we had when a witness was present was on Wednesday, April 23, when our witnesses were Mr. Jolliffe and Dr. Keenleyside. I presume Senator Roebuck will intimate whether in his opinion we should touch upon any of the information which they gave us at that time.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, I have not been able to get a draft, even of the roughest kind, for today. After all, we have a good deal of evidence, even today, and we have got two or three weeks yet. I suppose before the House rises. I have not given the matter any thought yet, for I have not had the opportunity to do so. I thought perhaps today we might gather up some views from the Committee as to the points that we should touch, if anybody has anything in his mind, and possibly we could meet again one week from to-day; and in that interval I will do my best to go through all this material. I will endeavour to get from Mr. Jolliffe what is the situation up to date, right to the moment, as to orders in council and policies and modifications, so that we shall be accurate in putting the picture as it is now, and know what is the immediate prospect in the matter of immigration. Then I thought of going all through this material again. I do not know what to say about it until I do.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, do you think it would answer any particular purpose now to go over the names?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Oh, it would not—just the names, because the secretary will give me that information.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Probably Senator Roebuck is more familiar with and more active in this matter than any other member of the Committee. I say that without casting reflections on any of the other members. My suggestion is that if he has the time to do so, and since he is so familiar with the subject and his opinions have pretty well crystallized on what ought to be done, he might put them in the form of a rough draft, and present it to the Committee, and we can then express our views, perhaps, more intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us say, a week from to-day.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: A week from to-day. I will have something.



The CHAIRMAN: A rough draft, to present to us. Would your Chairman be authorized in saying for the stenographic record that we will not print to-day's meeting as a separate hearing, but we will wait until we get the final report to add it to to-day's meeting?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: What would we gain by that? That is breaking our procedure.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I think we should print it, the same as we did the others, because these reports contain the evidence which has been given to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. You will recall, though, at the last committee meeting we thought we were through with the witnesses; and then Senator Wilson rose and asked that Miss Maines should come before us, and we agreed; and then yesterday we got advice that this doctor wished to come before us. But I have no objection.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I thought you said a moment ago that we were through here with witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we are through now with the witnesses, but we thought we were through last time.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: Let us say to-day that we are finally through.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: There was a fellow from Montreal wrote me, and I told him to be here to-day, and he is not here. There might be some error.

The CHAIRMAN: You may recall that we were going to have before us, before we closed, one of these gentlemen who represented labour organizations.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I know, but I put him off until next year. I told him to think about it for the next twelve months.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Now we have the views of these various bodies and organizations, would it be well to have the comments of Mr. Jolliffe on them?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, I thought of seeing Mr. Jolliffe in the course of drawing up the report and, as I said, bringing the facts up to date—because a lot of things have happened since he was here—and to get his concurrence in factual statements which I may make.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to entertain a motion that some of the evidence which was given here this morning be separately printed and typewritten and a copy sent to Mr. Jolliffe.

Hon. Mr. EULER: He has all this.

The CHAIRMAN: I know, but I had in mind this evidence about the Yugoslavs, and the Croats and what the United States has done to prevent the same thing occurring over there, and Canada not having taken that action.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I do not like the idea of preventing anybody from going where he pleases.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: No; it does not work out well in the end.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Is this committee going to make some suggestions regarding Communism, for instance? Do you not think we should go into that, and if Communism is what most of us think it is, it is not helpful to Canada and the sooner we get rid of these fellows the better. Why not consider the question of putting them out of the country? We do not care to have a few hundred thousand or a few thousand of these fellows. We are not in the market to sell something.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I would not like to entertain any idea of expelling them, but if they want to come, and they are Communists, I would not wish to admit them.



Hon. Mr. HUSHION: I would certainly expel them. They came here with the understanding that they would be good Canadian citizens, and if they do not live up to the standards of a good Canadian, why not expel them?

The CHAIRMAN: You would have to do a lot of "proving", and it might be difficult.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: That would not apply to those who are known as Communists, and I understand that a number of them are well known to be active Communists in Canada. Everybody who spoke here on the matter seemed to be able to put his finger on the agitators, and so on. Why should they not be told that they must quit, or get out?

Hon. Mr. EULER: This is still a free country.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: We will be charged with great intolerance if we did that.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: What have we to gain if we do not do something like that? Speaking of another matter, Senator Roebuck has said, I believe, that some changes have been made in the policy of the immigration branch. I have in mind three cases which came to me very recently, about a month or so ago. One is that of a girl whose family is here, and who is the only living relative of theirs in Europe. She is twenty-six years of age, healthy mentally and physically, I understand, but it appears that because she is twenty-six years old she cannot come here. I have Mr. Jolliffe's reply. Do you not think that this committee should exert some pressure on him to permit this lady to come in? And that is just one case.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: She has not got a father or a mother, a brother or a sister in Canada?

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Well, she has a sister.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well then, she can come in.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: No, because she is twenty-six years of age.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: No, that is not so.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Well, I may have read the letter wrongly, but I have it on my desk now. Another case was that of a man who wanted to bring in the remainder of his family—his sisters and sister-in-law and a few children. He was ready to put up the money and to give assurance that they would not be a charge on the country, but their admission also is refused. When I took up the case with the Immigration Branch I was told "the decision is according to the law, and you are out of luck." There always is some little technical obstacle. But as regards this young woman, as I understand it, the reason she is not admissible is that she is 26 or 28 years of age. If she were 21 years old she would be allowed in.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That applies to nieces.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: What is the difference?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, I do not think there should be.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: We should not cut hairs in this way. What is the difference between admitting a lady twenty years of age and one of twenty-one years of age, for instance?

Hon. Mr. EULER: Are those things all a matter of regulation?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, regulations by order in council. Our department now follows the regulations slavishly. I accused them not long since of being automatons. If you put in the right coin you get the answer.

The CHAIRMAN: The regulations have been changed a couple of times since this committee started meeting this year.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: They are not any better.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh my, yes, a great deal better, and it may be that they will be changed further.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: In what way are they better, may I ask?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I can tell you how they are better. The chief change is that we have allowed the families in. We have allowed them to bring in their wives and children.

Hon. Mr. HUSHION: Is that not only human?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, but it is a great advance over what we were doing previously. Insofar as nieces and nephews are concerned we first raised the age limit from sixteen to eighteen years and then from eighteen to twenty-one years. I do not agree with that limitation.

Hon. Mr. EULER: There should not be any limit at all.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course not.

The CHAIRMAN: When we get our report ready perhaps we can see Mr. Howe.

Hon. Mr. EULER: Why Mr. Howe?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Howe has been in charge of the department during the illness of Mr. Glen. Will it be satisfactory to the committee if I confer with Senator Roebuck and call the next meeting when we are ready for it?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: One week from to-day.

The CHAIRMAN: We will stand adjourned until a week from to-day at 10.30 a.m.

The committee adjourned until Wednesday, July 2, at 10.30 a.m.



1947

# THE SENATE OF CANADA



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

## Immigration and Labour

On the operation and administration of the  
Immigration Act, etc.

No. 14

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1947

The Honourable James Murdock, P.C., Chairman

CONTENTS:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

OTTAWA

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., B.A., L.Ph.,  
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY  
CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY

1947







## STANDING COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND LABOUR

The Honourable JAMES MURDOCK, P.C., Chairman

The Honourable Senators

Aseltine	Donnelly	McGeer
Blais	Dupuis	Molloy
Bouchard	Euler	Murdock
Bourque	Ferland	Pirie
Buchanan	Haig	Robertson
Burchill	Hardy	Robinson
Calder	Horner	Roebuck
Campbell	Hushion	Taylor
Crerar	Lesage	Vaillancourt
Daigle	Macdonald ( <i>Cardigan</i> )	Veniot
David	McDonald ( <i>Shediac</i> )	Wilson

## ORDER OF REFERENCE

EXTRACT from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Senate, Thursday, March 13, 1947.

"That the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour be authorized and directed to examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments) its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada, (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and other characteristics, (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission, (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission;

And that the said Committee report its findings to this house;

And that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

L. C. MOYER,  
*Clerk of the Senate.*

## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 9th July, 1947.

Pursuant to adjournment and notice the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour met this day at 10.30 a.m.

*Present:* The Honourable Senators: Murdock, Chairman; Burehill, Campbell, David, Euler, Ferland, Haig, Macdonald (*Cardigan*), McDonald (*Shediac*), Roebuck.—10.

The Committee resumed consideration of the Order of Reference of the 13th March, 1947, directing the Committee to examine into the operation and administration of the Immigration Act, etc.

A draft report was considered, amended and adopted.

At 11.45 o'clock, a.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chairman.

Attest.

H. ARMSTRONG,

*Clerk of the Committee.*

### REPORT

WEDNESDAY, 9th July, 1947.

The Standing Committee on Immigration and Labour beg leave to report as follows:

By order of Reference made on Thursday, March 13, 1947, your Committee was authorized and directed to:—

Examine into the Immigration Act (R.S.C. Chapter 93 and Amendments), its operation and administration and the circumstances and conditions relating thereto, including (a) the desirability of admitting immigrants to Canada (b) the type of immigrants which should be preferred, including origin, training and characteristics (c) the availability of such immigrants for admission (d) the facilities, resources and capacity of Canada to absorb, employ and maintain such immigrants, and (e) the appropriate terms and conditions of such admission.

In obedience to this Order of Reference, your Committee has enquired into the general subject of immigration, the Act and Regulations as amended from time to time, the manner in which the administration of the Act has been performed, and the progress that has been made during the past year and in previous years in meeting Canada's needs and obligations in this regard. In the course of its inquiries, your Committee has heard evidence submitted on the following dates by the Organizations and persons mentioned:

Witnesses appearing before the Immigration and Labour Committee, Session 1947, are as follows:—

April 23, 1947: Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, Director of Immigration, Department of Mines and Resources; Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister, Department of Mines and Resources.

April 24, 1947: Dr. Allen Peebles, Director, Research and Statistics Branch, Department of Labour; Mr. James Colley, Resident Representative, Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees; Reverend Ian MacKay, former U.N.R.R.A. worker in Germany.



April 30, 1947: Mr. R. N. Bryson, Toronto, Ontario, President of the Community Welfare Association of Ontario; Mr. Elmar V. Spielberg, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Latvian Relief Fund of Canada and Chairman, Federation of Baltic Canadians.

May 1, 1947: Lieut.-Colonel Arthur J. Hicks, Ottawa, Ontario, former Staff Officer, Military Government in Europe; Mr. Arthur Randles, C.B.E., M.S.M., Montreal, Quebec, Director and General Manager, Cunard Donaldson Limited (Montreal); Mr. Carl E. Waselius, Montreal, Quebec, District Manager, Swedish American Line.

May 7, 1947: Mr. H. C. P. Cresswell, Chief Commissioner, Department of Immigration and Colonization, Canadian Pacific Railway Company; Mr. G. M. Hutt, Development Commissioner, Canadian Pacific Railway Company; Mr. Frank W. Collins, Industrial Manager, Canadian Pacific Railway Company; Mr. Michael Garber, K.C., Montreal, Quebec, Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress; Mr. Saul Hayes, Montreal, Quebec, National Executive Director, Canadian Jewish Congress.

May 8, 1947: Mr. Karl Buzek, Toronto, Ontario, National Secretary, Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada; Mr. Rudolf Koren, Toronto, Ontario, President Czechoslovak National Alliance in Canada; Mr. Sven Stadius, Toronto, Ontario, Secretary, Toronto Finnish Advancement Association.

May 14, 1947: Mr. Percy R. Bengough, President, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Mr. John W. Buckley, Secretary-Treasurer, The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research, Canadian Congress of Labour; Mr. Pat Conroy, Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Congress of Labour; Mr. Herbert Marshall, Dominion Statistician, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

June 4, 1947: Mr. S. W. Fairweather, Vice-President of Research and Development, Canadian National Railways; Mr. J. S. McGowan, Director, Department of Colonization and Agriculture, Canadian National Railways; Mr. M. W. Maxwell, Chief of Development, Canadian National Railways; Mr. Frank Foulds, Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State; Colonel C. A. Krug, Assistant Director, Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of the Secretary of State.

June 5, 1947: Mr. William M. Teresio, President, Association of United Ukrainian Canadians; Miss Constance Hayward, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian National Committee on Refugees; Mr. B. K. Sandwell, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C., Toronto, Ontario, Honorary Chairman, Canadian National Committee on Refugees; Mr. George A. Wenige, Mayor of the City of London, Ontario; Mr. Stanley Lewis, O.B.E., LL.D., Mayor of the City of Ottawa, Ontario; Mr. James Colley, Resident Representative of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees.

June 12, 1947: Mr. A. Hlynka, M.P.; Mr. Jaroslaw William Arsenych, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Secretary of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee; Mr. Eusace Wasylyshen, Winnipeg, Manitoba, a member of the Executive Board of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee; Very Reverend Dr. Basil Kushnir, Winnipeg, Manitoba, President of Ukrainian Canadian Committee; Mr. Alex Skelton, Director General of Economic Research, Department of Reconstruction and Supply.

June 18, 1947: Mr. B. B. Dubiński, K.C., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Western Chairman, Canadian Polish Congress; Mr. Walter Dutkiewicz, Toronto, Ontario, representing Polish Democratic Association of Canada; Mr. B. Staniszewski, Toronto, Ontario, Executive Secretary, Canadian Polish Congress; Honourable Victor Podoski, Ottawa, Ontario, representing Council for Resettlement of Polish Refugees; Reverend R. Gordon Burgoyne, Montreal, Quebec, Canadian Manager, British Dominions Emigration Society; Mr. R. W. Keyserling, Montreal, Quebec, representing Baltic Relief Committee; Mr. M. G. Ballantyne, Montreal, Quebec, Editor, *The Canadian Register*, and Vice-Chairman of Baltic Relief.

June 25, 1947: Miss Joy A. Maines, Ottawa, Ontario, Executive Secretary, The Canadian Association of Social Workers; Dr. Mladen Giunio-Zorkin, Windsor, Ontario, Secretary of the Supreme Committee, Croatian Peasant Society.

The following documents have been filed:

April 24, 1947: Table of Occupational Classification of Displaced Persons in Europe according to skills.

April 30, 1947: List of Immigrants admitted to Canada during the year 1946; Brief by Mr. T. J. Keenan, Meadowbank Ranch, Lac La Hache, British Columbia, on Displaced Persons in Europe; Letter directed to the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, by Executive Secretary, Canadian Association of Social Workers, with respect to Displaced Persons of Europe.

May 7, 1947: Mr. Cresswell filed as an appendix to his brief a summary of Displaced Persons and a statement on Transfer of Capital.

May 8, 1947: Resolution by the Association of Professional Hotelmen of the Province of Quebec, recommending immigration to Canada of experienced chefs and cooks from European Allied Countries.

May 14, 1947: Submission by Alberta Sugar Beet Growers Association and Canadian Sugar Factories Ltd., on Labour requirements for Sugar Beet Growing in Southern Alberta.

June 5, 1947: Resolution passed by the London, Ontario, City Council on Immigration to Canada, presented by His Worship G. A. Wenige; Brief on Immigration on behalf of the Canada Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, presented by His Worship Mayor Stanley Lewis.

June 12, 1947: Resolution of the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada, urging the Government of Canada to admit to Canada displaced persons of Europe; Statement with respect to ships available in the United States which are suitable for carrying immigrants to Canada.

June 18, 1947: Recommendation of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, respecting immigration, adopted at the seventeenth Annual Meeting, Winnipeg, Manitoba, October, 1946; Memorandum from the American Resident Representative, Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, respecting Migration and Resettlement.

A number of the witnesses mentioned attended in Ottawa the last session of Parliament as well as this session and all came at their own expense and at considerable time and effort in order to impart their knowledge and views for the general public welfare. Your Committee expresses its gratitude and appreciation for the public spirited assistance which it has received.

Public opinion in favour of the admission of a considerable number of carefully selected immigrants seems to have developed since your Committee made its report in favour of properly regulated immigration during the Session of 1946, and to have become even more forceful and decided. Not a single witness advocated the closed door; all were in favour of immigration and of Canada doing her share in the rescue of the Displaced Persons of Europe, and there was general agreement that there should be careful selection in order to exclude those who by character or health are unfitted to play a useful part in Canada's system of democracy including social and economic democracy. Witnesses have accentuated the importance of bringing to Canada men and women of proven industry, skill and character who can be relied upon to contribute by their labour and virtues to Canada's welfare and to the maintenance of our comparatively high standard of living and way of life.

There has been some lessening of Governmental restrictions against immigration and a very great increase in Departmental activity, both of which your Committee heartily approves. Though there has been no very definite statement of Governmental policy in this regard, it would seem that a movement of some importance of people to this country has actually commenced. This will be the first movement of its kind to this country, in many years.

Following the year 1930, the number of immigrants entering Canada each year continually decreased, due to the depression supplemented by Governmental obstruction. During the first four years of the War, immigration practically closed. When hostilities ended, travel overseas to Canada was restricted by the shortage of ocean shipping. Return of service men and some 65,000 dependents, together with the repatriation of civilian Canadians abroad, exhausted available accommodation.

At the same time the need for action in other connections was very great. There was, and still is, in Canada a shortage of manpower in farming, lumbering, mining and shipping and to a considerable degree also in Urban industry, and in addition conditions in Europe following the war were and are deplorable. There are still 850,000 displaced persons in public camps under American and British jurisdiction. Thousands of Canadian citizens have relatives in the European countries, both in and out of the Government Camps, whom they earnestly desire to rescue. As might be expected, there have been many expressions of impatience at the continued delay.

The fact that transportation has been found by the Government and by private enterprise in certain cases added fuel to the discontent particularly of those whose relatives have remained unrescued.

The Government has endeavoured to meet the situation by repeated requests to the British Ministry of Transport for additional shipping, with some little success, and by the successive moderating of restrictive regulations.

In recent years, immigration has been limited to British subjects, United States citizens from that country, the wife and unmarried children under 18 years of residents of Canada, and agriculturalists with funds intending to farm in Canada.

On the 26th of May, 1946, the Government provided by Order in Council P.C. 2071, for the admission of the father and mother, the unmarried son and daughter without limitation as to age, the unmarried brother and sister and the nephew and niece orphaned of both parents and under 16 years of age, of persons legally resident in Canada, who are in a position to receive and care for such immigrants.

On January 30, 1947, the Regulations as to the admissibility were further widened by Order in Council P.C. 371, to include the widowed daughter and sister together with their unmarried children under 18 years of age, of legal residents of Canada, and the age limitation of orphaned nephews and nieces was raised from under 16 years to under 18 years of age. Provision was also made for the admission of farm labour and of persons experienced in mining, lumbering and logging when assured of employment.

The preference extended to single persons and the continued exclusion of relatives on the ground of marriage was the subject of many expressions of disapproval and on the 1st of May, 1947, the Prime Minister announced that the Order in Council as to those admissible had been revised to read as follows:

"The husband or wife; the son, daughter, brother or sister, together with husband or wife and unmarried children if any; the father or mother; the orphaned nephew or niece under 21 years of age; of any person legally resident in Canada who is in a position to receive and care for such relatives. The term "orphan" used in this clause means a child bereaved of both parents."

The effect of this enactment was to wipe out the legal ban against marriage, and to make admissible whole family units, short of married children, when one of the spouses comes within the class of admissible relatives. This change was hailed with joy in thousands of homes throughout Canada.

Up to this time, the fiancée of a male adult was admissible but not of a female adult. This meant that a man could bring an intended wife to Canada,



but a Canadian woman could not bring her intended husband. This was an unfair and unnecessary discrimination. The new Order abolished the distinction, making admissible:

"A person entering Canada for the purpose of marriage to a legal resident thereof; provided the prospective husband is able to maintain his intended wife."

This, too, brought joy in some quarters.

In his statement the Prime Minister recognized Canada's moral obligation to assist in meeting the problem of European refugees and displaced persons, and announced that the Government is taking steps looking towards the early admission to Canada of some thousands of their number.

This statement was followed by Order in Council P.C. 2180, dated 6th June, 1947, in which authority was provided for the "Immediate admission to Canada of 5,000 individuals from the Displaced Persons Camps in Europe." The selection and transportation to Canada of these persons is under the direction of the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, and their reception and distribution throughout Canada is to be arranged by the Department of Labour.

Under authority of this Order, the Department has approved the admission of 2,620 wood workers and requests have been received for the admission of garment workers, domestic workers and others, and consideration is being given.

The Alien Labour Law has been suspended when workers are coming to assured employment at the prevailing rates of wages.

During recent weeks the interpretation of the Orders in Council respecting admissibility have been relaxed and broadened. Since the regulations have permitted the admission of 5,000 Displaced Persons without the requirement of blood relationship and guarantee, the Department has taken the logical step of receiving applications supported by guarantees by Canadian residents for the admission of friends now in Displaced Persons Camps, as well as of relatives. Friends of Canadians who are prepared to back their friendship with the assumption of responsibility are assured of priority within the limitations imposed by the shortage of shipping.

While these changes in the Regulations were taking place, the Department of Immigration was preparing for the movement of people to Canada which may be expected to follow the provision of shipping. During the war, the Department's Branch Offices in Europe were necessarily closed, other than those in the United Kingdom. In November, 1946, Canadian Inspectional Offices were opened in France, Belgium and Holland, and provision was later made for the granting of visas at Canadian Missions in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, Greece, Palestine, and Pretoria, South Africa. Early this year offices have been opened in Warsaw, Poland. Visas to Canada are also granted by Canadian agencies in Buenos Aires, Argentine; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Santiago, Chili; Lima, Peru; Havana, Cuba; Mexico City, Mexico; St. Johns, Newfoundland; Wellington, New Zealand; Canberra, Australia; Dublin, Eire; Nanking, China and Shanghai. So that at the present time, Canada has Immigration Offices in which visas to Canada may be granted in 24 countries. This is a considerably larger number than existed prior to the war, the added offices being necessary because of present day restrictions on travel in Europe.

The Department has enlisted the aid of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, and together the Overseas Representatives of the Department and of this Committee have been searching out persons in Europe for whose admission to Canada applications have been made by relatives in Canada, or who are in public camps for Displaced Persons and who desire residence in



Canada. These people in considerable numbers are being examined by Canadian Inspectional Officers, whereupon the Committee Officers take charge of the problems of individual transportation.

Medical examinations have been conducted within the Camps with the aid of the Inter-Governmental Committee, but in this connection great difficulty has been met with outside the Camps, where the travel of intending immigrants is under military control. The Director of Immigration is now on his way to Europe to endeavour to facilitate arrangements for these medical examinations.

In Canada, the Department's Officers have been very active in receiving and reviewing applications and, when the proposed immigrants appear to be admissible under the regulations, in conducting investigations in all parts of Canada as to settlement conditions, that is to say, the financial ability of the applicants to guarantee the reception and subsequent success of the proposed immigrants. The volume of correspondence is very great and the rapidly growing store of active files is numbered in thousands.

A considerable number of applications have been received from farmers seeking farm labour help, and from lumbering, mining, shipping and manufacturing companies for men to engage in these occupations. Each application, if apparently bona fide and within the regulations, is the subject of special investigation. Many requests have been received from industrial companies seeking skilled and unskilled labour.

Early this year the Government agreed with the British Ministry to admit to Canada under obligation to work as agricultural labourers for a period of at least two years. 4,000 Polish soldiers from Italy. The Labour Department and the Department of Health and Welfare made the inspection of the applicants in Italy and 2,876 were admitted, shipping being provided when it suits its purposes by the British Ministry of Transport. Since then a further 1,630 Polish soldiers have been similarly admitted from England making a total of 4,506. These men are now working on farms throughout Canada where they are contributing to the Canadian economy and to the solution of the world food problem.

Your committee holds that immigration is a proper function of Government and that under no circumstances should control be permitted to fall into private hands. Such immigrants as are admitted should come to Canada under Government auspices, and should be free on arrival to accept employment from any employer within the class or classes of industry to which they are destined.

Such are the conditions under which 998 immigrants have recently arrived from Holland. They are agriculturists displaced by the war and for whom locations are not available in the Netherlands. Admission of these highly desirable immigrants was arranged between the Canadian Immigration Department and the Dutch Government, and Holland provided the required shipping. Others are expected to follow. Everyone of these immigrants has funds in Holland which it is hoped will later be transferred to Canada and every one has been applied for by a farmer applicant in Canada who has assured both housing and employment and each is accordingly destined to a pre-determined farmer.

Despite the number of persons wishing entry to Canada and the number of Canadians desiring to bring about admissions, the volume of immigrants arriving in Canada during the first three months of this year has been disappointingly small. Immigrants are 4,729 fewer for that period of 1947 than for the corresponding period of 1946. These entries numbered 8,009 this year as against 12,738 last year. The figures for persons of British national origin were 5,262 this year and 8,694 last year. The explanation of this decline is the shortage of shipping. Last year the British Ministry provided ships for the transportation of service men's wives and families, while for the period under review 1,000 immigrants only were in that category, as against 8,000 for the same period of last year.

So far there has been no immigration directly from Italy, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, Finland and Germany, for the citizens of these countries are still deemed to be enemy aliens. However, Treaties of Peace have been tabled in Parliament between Canada and Italy, Roumania, Hungary and Finland, and so soon as approved and completed the enemy obstruction will no longer exist, and the Canadian offices may be expected to be opened in these countries.

But even if these Treaties are completed as promptly as expected, the removal of the obstruction will apply to only the four countries named, and the nationals of Austria and Germany will still remain under the ban of a Canadian Order in Council prohibiting immigration to Canada from enemy countries. Your committee is of opinion that this Order in Council is now unnecessary and should be repealed.

The prohibition against the admission of enemy aliens has been moderated by the rule as to Refugees. Those who fled these countries during the war, or who were treated as slave labour, have not been regarded as enemy aliens, and some have been admitted.

It is reported that large numbers of persons in the British Isles are willing and anxious to come to Canada or other of the self-governing British countries. Various estimates of from 300,000 to still more impressive figures have been published. Australia signed an agreement with the British Ministry effective on and after April 1 of this year, under which Great Britain pays the passage of British soldiers migrating permanently to that country. Similar agreements have not, so far, been offered to other Dominions. Australia expects a normal flow of 70,000 immigrants annually, 40,000 of them from Great Britain. Twenty thousand from Britain is the Australian estimate for this year. It is estimated by Mr. Randles, of the Cunard Donaldson White Star Line, that 25,000 will be the maximum number of immigrants which can be transported to Canada from overseas this year.

Whether or not this estimate can be exceeded will depend on the success achieved by Mr. A. L. Jolliffe, the Canadian Director of Immigration, who a few days ago left for England where he will urge upon the British Ministry of Transport the desirability of a more generous assignment of shipping to the Canadian service.

Your Committee wishes Mr. Jolliffe success, for as stated above, so far this year the numbers of immigrants arriving in Canada is very disappointing, and particularly so within the classification of relatives. There are an estimated 15,000 persons in Europe for whom admission to Canada has been requested by close relatives within the degrees defined, who have signed the Department's form of guarantee, and who have been found by the Department able financially to discharge the obligations assumed, and so far only 275 of these proposed immigrants have arrived in Canada.

This practical failure of Canadian citizens to rescue unfortunate relatives in Europe is due to the requisition by the British Ministry of ships which would otherwise ply the Canadian route. The Cunard White Star Line has been endeavouring to procure return to its service of several of its passenger liners still requisitioned by the British Ministry. It was hoped that the *Ascania* with 850 passenger capacity, would be released this summer but so far the only ship in the Canadian regular service is the Canadian Pacific Liner, *Empress of Canada*, which makes its first sailing from Liverpool on the 16th of July supplemented by part-time assignment of the *Aquitania* a 46,000-ton former troopship, which has been on the Canadian route since the first of the year, and is promised to remain until September.

Dr. Hugh Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, said recently that the total shipping space available for all passengers is sufficient for the accommodation of only 3,000 per month, and of these 200 to 300 per month only it is expected will be immigrants.

This dismal prospect was considerably brightened within the past few days by an announcement that the Right Honourable C. D. Howe, Acting Minister of Immigration, had arranged with the North American Transport Company for the assignments of its ship, *Huascara* to the immigration service exclusively. The ship was turned over to Canada by the Reparations Committee at a German port in a damaged condition and was promptly sold by Canada through the War Assets Corporation to the above Company. The ship is now in Canada undergoing repairs and refitting and is expected to be ready for service some time in September. It is a fast ship capable of a round trip every three weeks and will carry 600 passengers.

Some few immigrants have been fortunate in obtaining transportation to Canada via United States ports.

There has been talk of reconditioning cargo ships for passenger accommodation but this is said to be impossible by private companies without active Government cooperation because passenger ships must comply with the British Board of Trade regulations and this is impracticable. A Government can disregard safety and other regulations and a private company cannot.

The cost of building passenger liners is several times in excess of pre-war prices, and the shipping companies say that such construction is economically impossible without Government assurance of continued immigration, an assurance which so far has not been given.

Your Committee approves the action of the Government in broadening the Regulations to include the families of those admitted on the ground of relationship. That is to say, the wives and husbands and the children of the sons and daughters and brothers and sisters of Canadians able and willing to receive and care for them. The Committee also approves the increase in the age limit of orphaned nephews and nieces from 18 to 21 years. Your Committee would go further, however, and recommends, that so soon as the main body of the classes as now defined are disposed of by admission or otherwise, the classes be further broadened to include cousins and their families and nephews and nieces of all ages and whether or not orphaned or married.

Your Committee is of opinion that generally speaking the best immigrants obtainable are the relatives of persons who are already here and who have themselves made good to the extent that they are in a position to guarantee the success of the newcomer relatives from abroad. Such immigrants have a welcome awaiting them, and someone to aid, guide and advise them on arrival and during the establishment stages following. They have a family source from which to learn the Canadian way of life, how things are done in Canada, and how to be successful, and they have before them an example of success. Such immigrants are the most likely of all newcomers to develop into permanent Canadians and are the least likely by reason of loneliness, lack of ties, unsuccess, or otherwise, to make Canada a mere port of entry to some other country.

For these reasons we recommend the broadening of the Regulations immediately, to include relatives of all degrees together with their families and without limit as to age.

Your Committee favours the married immigrant over the unmarried man or woman. Freedom from responsibility may be a temporary convenience under some circumstances, but when permanent citizens are being sought the advantage of the family unit is very great.

In Your Committee's records there appears a statement by the Episcopate of the Province of Quebec expressing approval of aid by Canada to "those displaced and wandering populations of many European countries by allowing them to come and settle in Canada" but the Reverend Bishops warn of the "necessity of safeguarding the peace of our constitutionally Christian country and of basing the future prosperity of our country first of all in the family."



Your Committee recommends that preference be given to family groups over unmarried men and women, and that efforts be made to bring to Canada in each instance the entire family group so that the transplanting of the unit be complete and nothing remain in Europe to preserve a divided interest and loyalty.

We have had experience in this connection. Some years ago numbers of men arrived from European countries, intending to bring their wives and families to join them later when they had themselves become established and had earned the cost of transportation. The depression of 1930 followed and then the war, and the result is many families have remained separated through the years and are still separated. Such conditions are to be avoided.

It would have been better for these people and for Canada had it been made possible for all to come together to the new land of their adoption.

There has been an apparent tendency recently in connection with the Immigration sponsored by the Labour Department to favour single men and women. That policy should be reconsidered with a view to long term advantages rather than to immediate and temporary convenience. In those cases when single persons have been admitted, every facility should be given for the subsequent admission of spouses and families and fiancées.

The Secretary of State for Canada, is giving attention to the problem of receiving and welcoming immigrants on their arrival in Canada. Representatives of his Department have already been active in imparting information as to Canadian Civics and what is known as "the Canadian way of life." This is admirable, and your Committee heartily approves the general principle of their plans, and bespeaks the co-operation of the Provinces. It is important that immigrants be made into informed and loyal Canadians as promptly as possible.

There is some difficulty in laying down a general policy, and some objection to settling policies for months or years to come, but something of the kind is now required. Beyond the Order in Council that Canada will admit 5,000 Displaced Persons, as a part of her aid-to-Europe contribution, and the presently defined classes of admissible persons; there is no settled policy in existence. One may assume what Canada will do, in this regard in the future, but there is no pronouncement upon which business men may rely. An immigration movement to be successful must be organized. Ships must be provided, and shipping companies will not build or redesign vessels for the immigrant service unless assured for at least a few years of continuous employment. Facilities for the reception of immigrants, their primary education and training and their settlement in rural or urban communities cannot be successfully provided on a short term or sporadic basis. What is needed is a steady flow of newcomers maintained over the years, and the first essential to the planning of such a movement is the Governmental assurance that it will be permitted. Such a pronouncement of policy would take courage, but it would be worthwhile.

The defining by regulations of the classes of admissible persons has served the useful purpose of establishing priorities for those groups whom it was thought were most needy, most deserving and most desirable, but such rules, if too rigidly followed, may become straight-jackets. It is difficult to imagine anything more cruel than stereotyped phrases rigidly applied as determining who can come to Canada and who cannot. A rule differs from a law in that it may be broken with impunity when circumstances warrant, and should at times be broken. In recent months the rules of admissibility as laid down in the regulations have been applied in a manner reminiscent of the laws of the Medes and Persians which altered not. Hardship in certain cases has resulted. For example, nephews and nieces who have attained 21 years of age have been flatly turned down. So too have the married children of sons, daughters, brothers and sisters. Can one imagine a father and mother with a number of children leaving one child behind because married. Grounds of excessive hardship or unusual circumstances are seldom or never considered by our Immigration Authorities because of the



inflexibility of the Regulations. Pleas for sympathy fall on deaf ears. This should not be, and it is not in keeping with the real character of our Immigration officials, who are by inclination sympathetic, helpful and understanding.

This Committee recommends that the Government extend to its Immigration Officials a greater liberty of discretion in special cases, and it suggests that the officials themselves take courage to apply for special Orders in Council whenever circumstances warrant, so that undesirable rigidity be avoided and the administration of the Act be made as humane and considerate as possible.

Your Committee reports that its meetings have constituted a research into conditions relating to Immigration which in its opinion has been exceedingly valuable. The oral evidence given, and the carefully prepared statements and briefs in considerable numbers contain a vast amount of useful information. The material contained in the Record is too great for even summary in this Report, but it has enabled the Committee to reach a number of general conclusions.

We are of opinion—

(1) That there are within Canada natural resources sufficient for the support of a very much larger population than Canada now possesses, providing the resources are intelligently used for production, and not merely held.

(2) Industrial conditions in Canada are favourable at present for a considerable expansion in manpower both in primary industries and in manufacturing.

(3) The admission of a considerable number of immigrants to engage in farming, lumbering, mining and shipping, and as well, those skilled in urban production, would not now lower the standard of living in Canada, but rather would at present tend to improve it.

(4) A better balanced economy, the result of an expansion of industries other than farming, can be brought about only by increases in population.

(5) There are available in Europe numbers of skilled artisans, technicians and professional men, workers experienced in new trades and masters of various established arts, men having creative and managerial capacity capable of founding new industries or improving old ones, "entrepreneurs" and so forth. Such men should be welcomed to this country in all cases where there is a reasonable assurance that they will add to our knowledge, capacity or efficiency, contribute to our economy, or assist us in competition.

(6) In the Camps for Displaced Persons in Europe there are great numbers of people who are suitable in accordance with the most exacting standards, for settlement as immigrants in this country.

(7) The success achieved in past years by immigrants of such National groups as Ukrainians, Poles, Greeks, Scandinavians, Germans, Italians, Hungarians, Austrians, Roumanians and others, as described in many weighty representations, convinces us that the policy of admitting such people should be continued.

(8) Public opinion approves a carefully selective immigration in numbers not exceeding from time to time the absorptive capacity of our country, and industrial and economic conditions at present are favourable. The Government should in consequence find some way to provide the necessary ocean transportation, the failure of which is the only physical bar now to a successful immigration movement.

All which is respectfully submitted.

JAMES MURDOCK,

*Chairman.*



















GOVT PUBNS

BINDING SECT. JUL 2 1980



